



Proceedings of the 64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

NCAA

WASHINGTON, D.C. / JANUARY 12-14, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Register, 1970

Administrative Council
Convention Delegates

II. Proceedings of the 64th Annual Convention

Opening Session, Tuesday

1. Opening Remarks

2. Presentation of the Yearbook

3. Report

4. Report

5. Report

6. Report

Wednesday, January 15

1. Session

2. Session

3. Session

College Division, Tuesday

MOITACIOSA

1970-1971

1. Session

2. Session

3. Session

4. Session

5. Session

Continuation of Session, Tuesday

1. Report of the Treasurer

2. Proposed Amendments

3. Amendments

4. Amendments

5. Amendments

6. Amendments

7. Amendments

8. Amendments

9. Amendments

10. Amendments

11. Amendments

12. Amendments

13. Amendments

14. Amendments

15. Amendments

*Proceedings
of the*

**64th Annual
Convention**

of the

**National Collegiate
Athletic Association**

Statler Hilton Hotel

Washington, D. C.

January 12-14, 1970



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

1221 Baltimore Avenue

816/221-7127

Kansas City, Missouri 64105

May 20, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register, 1970

Administrative Organization	5
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Press	7

II. Proceedings of the 64th Annual Convention

Opening Business Session

1. Opening Remarks	18
2. Explanation of Voting Procedures	18
3. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	20
4. Report of the Executive Committee	22
5. Report of the Council	24
6. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions	28

Faculty Representatives-Athletic Directors Round Table

Junior College Relations	31
Amateurism—Changes Not To Be Made	37
Recruiting—Changes To Be Made	41

College Division Round Table

Costs of Intercollegiate Athletics	50
--	----

Honors Luncheon

Introduction of Toastmaster	66
Introduction of Postgraduate Scholarship Winners	68
Introduction of Modern All-Time Football Team	70
Introduction of Honored Governors and Cabinet Members ..	73
Presentation of Theodore Roosevelt Award	77

Continuance of Business Session

7. Report of the Television Committee	83
8. Proposed Amendments	
Amendments	83
Principles of Ethical Conduct	84
Five-Year Rule	85
Principles Governing Individual Eligibility	86
Vice-Presidents' Reports	89
Transfer of Membership	89
Committees	90
Freshman Rule	94
Transfer Rule	95

1970 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

President

HARRY M. CROSS, University of Washington
Professor of Law

Secretary-Treasurer

WILLIAM J. FLYNN, Boston College
Director of Athletics

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, Midland Building, Kansas City, Missouri

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Nine members of the Council are the eight District Vice-Presidents and the Vice-President-at-Large each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Seven members are elected at-large for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

Vice-Presidents

Term Expires

District 1—Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic
InstituteJan. 1972
Head, Department of Physical Education and Athletics

District 2—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard UniversityJan. 1971
Associate Professor of Physical Education

District 3—H. Boyd McWhorter, University of GeorgiaJan. 1972*
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

District 4—James R. McCoy, Ohio State UniversityJan. 1971*
Dean, College of Administrative Science

District 5—David Swank, University of OklahomaJan. 1972*
Professor of Law and Legal Counsel

District 6—J. William Davis, Texas Tech UniversityJan. 1971*
Professor of Government

District 7—Louis A. Myers, University of ArizonaJan. 1972
Professor of Accounting

District 8—Raymond T. Ellickson, University of Oregon ...Jan. 1971
Professor of Physics

At-Large—Wilford H. Ketz, Union College (N.Y.)Jan. 1972*
Director of Institutional Studies

* Serving second term.

Competitive Designation	96
1.600 Rule	97
NCAA Athletic Events	97
Recruiting	97
Extra Events	106
Freshman Rule	106
Playing and Practice Seasons	106

9. Review of Interpretations

Institutional Aid	107
Awards	110
Institutional Eligibility	110
Recruiting—Tryouts	112
Recruiting—Visitation	112
Recruiting—Entertainment	113
Extra Events	114
Limitation on Playing Seasons	114
Recruiting—Tryouts	114
Recruiting—Pre-College Expense	114

10. Other Proposals

Revisions of Executive Regulations	115
Revision of Recommended Policies	117
Revision of Enforcement Procedure	117
Resolution	118
Revisions of Executive Regulations	119

11. Report of the Committee on Committees120

12. Report of the Nominating Committee122

III. Appendices

Appendix A

Proposed Amendments	A- 1
Review of Interpretations	A-21
Revisions of Executive Regulations	A-29
Revision of Recommended Policies and Practices	A-32
Revision of Enforcement Procedure	A-33
Resolution	A-34

Appendix B

Convention Committees	A-35
-----------------------------	------

Appendix C

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA	A-37
---	------

Appendix D

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1970	A-38
--	------

1970 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Council (Continued)

<i>Members-at-Large</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Frank F. Carver, University of Pittsburgh	Jan. 1972
Secretary to Board of Trustees	
Alan J. Chapman, Rice University	Jan. 1971
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering	
Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University	Jan. 1972
Vice-President for Public and Alumni Affairs	
Arthur W. Nebel, University of Missouri, Columbia	Jan. 1971
Dean, School of Social and Community Services	
Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Jan. 1971
Professor of Education	
Dwight T. Reed, Lincoln University (Mo.)	Jan. 1972
Director of Athletics	
Adolph W. Samborski, Harvard University	Jan. 1973
Director of Athletics	

Executive Committee

The NCAA President, Vice-President-at-Large and Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining seven members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.

Stan Bates, Washington State University (Jan. 1970)
Director of Athletics
Wayne Duke, Big Eight Conference (Apr. 1969)
Commissioner
Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan (Jan. 1969)
Professor of Law
Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa (Jan. 1965)
Dean, Division of Extension and University Services
Polk F. Robison, Texas Tech University (Jan. 1970)
Athletic Administrator of Finance and Development
Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines (Jan. 1967)
Dean of Students
James H. Weaver, Atlantic Coast Conference (Jan. 1968)
Commissioner

SIXTY-FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

American International College: Joseph J. O'Grady
 Amherst College: Benjamin F. McCabe
 Assumption College: Andrew Laska
 Bates College: Lloyd H. Lux
 Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
 Boston College: William J. Flynn
 Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
 Boston University: Robert R. Peck, Warren Schmakel
 Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
 Bridgeport, University of: Herbert E. Glines, Fran Poisson
 Brown University: John M. Heffernan
 Bryant College: Tom Folliard
 Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas
 Colby College: John W. Winkin
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Toner, Robert Ingalls,
 Paul N. Taylor
 Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters, Alden H. Burnham,
 Elliot B. Noyes
 Eastern Connecticut State College: Dana E. Clark
 Hartford, University of: A. Peter Lo Maglio, Raymond J. Kudla
 Harvard University: Adolph W. Samborski, Eric Cutler
 Holy Cross College: Vincent G. Dougherty
 Lowell Technological Institute: W. W. Yarnall
 Maine, University of: Harold S. Westerman, Frank W. Myers
 Massachusetts, University of: Warren P. McGuirk,
 Robert W. O'Connell
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
 Middlebury College: Richard W. Colman, Jr.
 New Hampshire, University of: Andrew Mooradian,
 Lionel J. Carbonneau
 New Haven College: Donald R. Ormrod
 Nichols College of Business Administration: Hal Chalmers
 North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
 Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph P. Zabilski
 Plymouth State College: Paul E. Arnold
 Providence College: Rev. Aloysius B. Begley
 Quinnipiac College: Burt Kahn
 Rhode Island, University of: Maurice Zarchen
 Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
 Salem State College: Richard L. Schneider
 Southern Connecticut State College: Jess L. Dow, Eugene Shelar
 Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz

Stonehill College: James D. Dougher
 Trinity College: Karl Kurth, Jr.
 Tufts University: Harry Arlanson, Eugene S. Ashton
 U. S. Coast Guard Academy: Cdr. Carl W. Selin
 Vermont, University of: J. Edward Donnelly, Denis E. Lambert
 Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Williams College: Frank R. Thoms, Jr.
 Windham College: Donald H. Amaral
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard
 Yale University: DeLaney Kiphuth, James A. Holgate,
 David Smoyer, G. Clinton Jones IV

District Two

Adelphi University: James L. Bedell
 Alfred University: Alex Yunevich
 American University: Anthony Morella, Robert H. Frailey,
 Fritz Witt
 Brooklyn College: Joseph M. Smith, Charles Tobey
 Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour
 C. W. Post College: William T. Lai
 California (Pa.) State College: Paul E. Ross
 Canisius College: Robert A. MacKinnon
 Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence
 City College of New York: Robert M. Behrman, Harold Johnson
 Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
 Clarkson College: John J. Hantz
 Colgate University: Harold W. Lahar
 Columbia University: Kenneth G. Germann, Al Paul
 Cornell University: Robert J. Kane
 Delaware, University of: David M. Nelson, Raymond Duncan,
 George F. Frick
 Delaware State College: James H. Williams
 Delaware Valley College: Ned A. Linta
 Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson
 Drexel University: John Semanik
 East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler
 Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley
 Fairleigh Dickinson University (Madison): Robert T. Shields
 Fairleigh Dickinson University (Teaneck): Harvey D. Woods,
 George Manfredi
 Fordham University: Peter A. Carlesimo
 Franklin & Marshall College: W. Roy Phillips
 Gannon College: Howard (Bud) Elwell
 Georgetown University: Robert H. Sigholtz
 Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas
 Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Maurice G. Verbeke
 Hamilton College: Mox A. Weber
 Hampton Institute: Herman N. Neilson, Robert M. Screen
 Haverford College: Dana W. Swan
 Herbert H. Lehman College: James Frank
 Hobart College: William C. Stiles, Alva E. Kelley
 Howard University: James T. Chambers, Samuel E. Barnes

Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Samuel G. Smith
 Ithaca College: Carlton Wood
 Juniata College: Walt Nadzak, Jr.
 King's College: Edward F. Donohue
 Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll
 LaSalle College: John J. Conboy, Robert J. Courtney
 Lebanon Valley College: William D. McHenry
 Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby, Craig Anderson
 LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland, Jr.
 Lincoln University: Manuel Rivero
 Long Island University: Roy Rubin, Jerry Donner
 Lycoming College: David G. Busey
 Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi, Anthony R. Kuolt
 Morgan State College: Edward P. Hurt, Robert A. Smith
 Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell
 New York, State University of, Albany: John Ralph Tibbetts,
 Alfred C. Werner
 New York State, University of, Buffalo: Bob Deming
 New York, State University of, Maritime College: Roger Reinhart
 New York, State University College, Buffalo: Howard A. Meyers,
 Howard B. MacAdam
 New York, State University College, Cortland: Francis J. Woods
 New York, State University College, Fredonia: Patrick R. Damore
 New York, State University College, Geneseo: Robert F. Riedel
 New York, State University College, New Paltz: Albert E. Negratti
 New York, State University College, Oswego: John V. Glinski
 New York, State University College, Plattsburgh: Joseph C. Jastrab,
 Ernest P. Rangazas
 New York, State University College, Potsdam: Sam Molnar
 New York University: Ben L. Carnevale, Miguel de Capriles,
 Jay Horwitz
 PMC Colleges: George A. Hansell
 Pace College: Peter X. Finnerty
 Pennsylvania, University of: Fred A. Shabel, Richard L. Corrigan
 Pennsylvania State University: Ralph H. Wherry, Edward M. Czekaj,
 Ernest B. McCoy, Edward L. Mattil, Robert J. Scannell,
 James I. Tarman
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
 Pittsburgh, University of: Paul H. Masoner, Frank Carver,
 Walter P. Cummins, Casmir J. Myslinski
 Pratt Institute: E. Wayne Sunderland, Jr.
 Princeton University: R. Kenneth Fairman
 Queens College: Robert J. Tierney, Charles L. Crawford
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Warren C. Lutes
 Rider College: Thomas A. Petroff
 Rutgers University: Albert W. Twitchell, Frederick E. Gruninger,
 Mark E. Singley, Les Unger
 St. Francis College (Pa.): I. V. Davis
 St. John's University: Walter T. McLaughlin
 St. Joseph's College: Paul Westhead
 St. Lawrence University: Thomas A. Cartmill
 Scranton, University of: David R. Ocorr
 Seton Hall University: Rev. John J. Horgan

Shepherd College: Michael Josephs
 Siena College: Eugene J. Culnan
 Slippery Rock State College: William C. Meise, Bradley F. Keith
 Swarthmore College: Willis J. Stetson
 Syracuse University: James H. Decker, Ferdinand Geiger
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
 Union College: George W. Flood, Wilford H. Ketz
 U. S. Merchants Marine Academy: Capt. James W. Liebertz
 U. S. Military Academy: Col. A. J. Dielens, Jr.
 U. S. Naval Academy: Capt. John O. Coppedge
 Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey
 Utica College: Eric H. Huggins
 Wagner College: Herbert E. Sutter
 West Chester State College: Robert W. Reese, Robert P. Nye
 Wilkes College: John G. Reese

District Three

Alabama, University of: Willard F. Gray, Jefferson J. Coleman
 Alabama State University: C. Johnson Dunn
 Auburn University: Charles Simmons, G. W. Beard
 Austin Peay State University: Leon Bibb, David B. Aaron
 Baltimore, University of: Arthur R. Bosley
 Belmont Abbey College: Ted Crunkleton
 Benedict College: John E. Brown
 Bridgewater College: James A. Reedy
 Catholic University: Brian McCall
 Centre College: Briscoe Inman
 Citadel, The: Col. David S. McAlister, Helen Johnson,
 Jean Marshall, Col. Edward L. Teague
 Clemson University: R. R. Ritchie, C. H. McLellan, Jr.
 Davidson College: Frontis W. Johnston, Tom Scott, F. B. Outlaw
 Duke University: Alan Kornberg, Edmund M. Cameron, Carl James
 East Carolina University: Clarence Stasavich
 East Tennessee State University: Solon Gentry
 Eastern Kentucky University: Glenn E. Presnell
 Emory University: William Clyde Partin
 Fisk University: Herbert B. Thompson
 Florida, University of: Mandell Glicksberg, Percy Beard,
 Norm Carlson, Ray Graves
 Florida State University: Vaughn H. Mancha
 George Washington University: Edward A. Caress, Robert K. Faris
 Georgia, University of: Joel Eaves, H. Boyd McWhorter
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Jesse W. Mason, John McKenna
 Georgia Southern College: James I. Clements, Jr.
 Hampden-Sydney College: Richard A. Burrell
 Jacksonville University: Judson B. Harris, Jr.
 Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner, Jr.
 Kentucky, University of: Harry C. Lancaster, William L. Matthews,
 Jr.
 Kentucky State College: Henry E. Cheaney, William Exum
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. William Douglas
 Livingstone College: Walter E. Brown, Jr.
 Louisiana Polytechnic Institute: Harold J. Smolinski
 Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge: Carl Maddox

Loyola College: Emil G. Reitz, Jr.
 Maryland, University of, College Park: John E. Faber,
 James H. Kehoe
 Maryville College: Jerry Waters
 Memphis State University: R. M. Robison, Ruffner P. Murray
 Miami, University of: Charles M. Capps, Dale A. Lewis
 Middle Tennessee State University: E. K. Patty
 Millsaps College: James A. Montgomery
 Mississippi, University of: T. A. Bickerstaff
 Mississippi State University: Charles N. Shira
 Morehead State University: Robert Laughlin
 Morehouse College: Frank L. Forbes
 Morris Brown College: Major J. Powell, Jr., James Abrams
 Mount Saint Mary's College: J. D. Broussard, James G. Deegan
 Norfolk State College: Ernest D. Fears, Jr.
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: E. McG. Hedgpeth,
 Walter Rabb, Homer C. Rice
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks,
 Calvin Doss
 North Carolina A&T State University: Artis P. Graves,
 Albert E. Smith
 North Carolina Central University: James W. Younge
 North Carolina State University: Ralph E. Fadum, Willis R. Casey
 Old Dominion University: Arthur B. Metheny, Herbert L. Sebren
 Randolph-Macon College: Hugh F. Stephens
 Richmond, University of: Frank Jones
 St. Paul's College: Joseph E. Thompson
 South, University of the: Walter D. Bryant
 South Alabama, University of: Melvin Lucas
 South Carolina, University of: Weems O. Baskin, Jr., Paul F. Dietzel
 South Florida, University of: E. E. Stanton, Jr., Richard T. Bowers
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Lloyd Milam
 Southwestern College: William R. Maybry
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: W. Drayton Lewis
 Stillman College: Jesse Hosey
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Rayford J. McLaurin
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Earl M. Ramer,
 George R. Woodruff
 Tennessee State University: Howard C. Gentry
 Tennessee Technological University: R. Hooper Eblen
 Towson State College: Earl Killian, William Carey
 Tulane University: Hugh F. Rankin, Harvey M. Jessup, Rix N. Yard
 Tuskegee Institute: H. Frank Leftwich, Jr.
 Vanderbilt University: Jess C. Neely
 Virginia, University of: D. Alan Williams, Steve Sebo
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, Jerry D. Claiborne,
 W. B. Matthews, Frank O. Moseley, Donald T. Perry
 Virginia State College: William B. Bradley
 Wake Forest University: John W. Sawyer, Jesse Haddock,
 Gene E. Hooks
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey
 Washington & Lee University: Eugene F. Corrigan
 West Virginia, University of: Ruel E. Foster, Robert N. Brown

Western Maryland College: Richard A. Clower, C. Wray Mowbray, Jr.
 William & Mary, College of: Robert A. Johnston, H. Lester Hooker, Jr.
 Winston-Salem State College: Clarence E. Gaines

District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson
 Ashland College: Fred Martinelli, Robert Brownson, George H. Donges
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee J. Tressel
 Ball State University: Philip E. Ballou, Robert W. Primmer, Donald S. Shondell
 Beloit College: Clarence E. Von Eschen
 Bowling Green State University: Kenneth H. McFall, Doyt L. Perry
 Butler University: William L. Howard
 Capital University: William F. Bernlohr
 Central Michigan University: Daniel P. Rose
 Central State University: Albert H. Baker
 Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass
 Dayton, University of: Thomas J. Frericks, H. C. Baujan
 Denison University: LeRoy G. Seils, Francis C. Bayley
 DePauw University: Robert D. Loring, James C. Loveless
 Detroit, University of: Robert J. Calihan
 Eastern Illinois University: Tom Katsimpalis
 Eastern Michigan University: F. L. Ferzacca, George W. Linn
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer
 Illinois, University of: Henry S. Stillwell, E. Eugene Vance
 Illinois, University of, Chicago Circle: Richard C. Kohler, Sheldon L. Fordham, Walter G. Versen
 Illinois State University: Warren S. Perry, Milton E. Weisbecker
 Indiana State University: S. Woodrow Suttle, Gordon H. Chalmers
 Indiana University: Edwin H. Cady, J. William Orwig
 Iowa, University of: Robert F. Ray, Forest Evashevski
 John Carroll University: George A. Kmieck
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla L. Anderson
 Kent State University: Carl E. Erickson, Walton D. Clarke
 Kenyon College: Phillip J. Morse
 Macalester College: Ralph Lundeen
 MacMurray College: William L. Wall
 Mankato State College: Richard G. Koppenhaver
 Marquette University: Samuel P. Saucedo
 Marshall University: Harold L. Willey, Charles E. Kautz
 Miami University: Fred Cottrell, Richard G. Shrider
 Michigan, University of: Marcus L. Plant, Donald B. Canham
 Michigan State University: John A. Fuzak, Clarence L. Munn
 Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Max O. Schultze, Marshall W. Ryman
 Mount Union College: Jackson W. Rafeld
 Muskingum College: Edgar A. Sherman
 Northern Illinois University: Clyde C. Walton, Robert J. Brigham, Nye Labaw
 Northern Michigan University: Henry A. Heimonen, Rollie Dotsch

Northwestern University: T. Leroy Martin, W. H. H. Dye, Waldo A. Fisher
 Notre Dame, University of: Edward W. Krause, Rev. Edmund P. Joyce, Jack Stephens
 Oberlin College: Lysle K. Butler
 Ohio State University: James R. McCoy, Richard C. Larkins, J. E. Weaver
 Ohio University: Fred Picard, William D. Rohr
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer
 Otterbein College: Robert Agler
 Purdue University: Roy L. Whistler, Guy J. Mackey, Pinky Newell
 Purdue University, Calumet Campus: Robert C. Hayes
 St. Cloud State College: Edward Colletti, Robert A. Peterson
 St. Joseph's College: Andrew G. Mehall
 St. Olaf College: Axel C. Bundgaard
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: William P. Dommermuth, Donald N. Boydston
 Toledo, University of: A. G. Francis
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig
 Wabash College: Max E. Servies
 Wayne State University: Vernon K. Gale
 Western Illinois University: Frank D. Sorenson, Loren Dittus, Harry G. Fritz, Ray Hanson
 Western Michigan University: Leo C. Vanderbeek, Joseph T. Hoy
 Wheaton College: Donald C. Boardman, Harvey C. Chrouser
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Frank J. Remington, William H. Aspinwall
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Herman Kluge
 Wittenberg University: William M. Edwards
 Xavier University: James J. McCafferty, Jack Cherry
 Youngstown State University: Willard L. Webster

District Five

Augustana College: A. L. Sponberg
 Bradley University: Orville Nothdurft, Charles K. Orsborn
 Central Missouri State College: Floyd Walker
 Cincinnati, University of: George D. Smith
 Coe College: Glenn J. Drahn
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Fred Casotti, Edwin B. Crowder
 Creighton University: Dan Offenburger
 Drake University: Robert D. Karnes
 Iowa State University: Maurice W. Soult, Harry G. Burrell, G. Clayton Stapleton
 Kansas, University of: Laurence C. Woodruff, Wade R. Stinson
 Kansas State Teachers College: Joseph M. Pease
 Kansas State University: C. Clyde Jones, Ernie D. Barrett
 Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed
 Louisville, University of: Carl E. Abner
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Arthur W. Nebel
 Morningside College: R. D. Halford
 Nebraska, University of: John R. Davis, Don Bryant
 North Dakota, University of: Harold L. Pedersen, Leonard R. Marti
 North Dakota State University: Ronald P. Erhardt

North Texas State University: William A. Miller, Jess E. Cearley
 Northeast Missouri State College: John D. Black, James J. Dougherty
 Northern Iowa, University of: James H. Witham
 Oklahoma, University of: David Swank, Gomer T. Jones
 Oklahoma State University: Randall J. Jones, Donald L. Cooper
 St. Louis University: Lawrence K. Albus, Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti
 South Dakota, University of: John O. Roning
 South Dakota State University: Stanley J. Marshall
 Southwest Missouri State College: Aldo A. Sebben
 Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz, Glenn Dobbs, Jr.
 Wichita State University: Robert M. Holmer, Albert C. Katzenmeyer

District Six

Abilene Christian College: Garvin Beauchamp
 Alcorn A&M College: Marino H. Casem, Ernest A. Boykins
 Arkansas, University of: John E. Kane
 Arkansas AM&N College: Vannette W. Johnson
 Arkansas State University: Don Floyd, Sammy R. Gennuso
 Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, R. E. Henderson
 Centenary College: Orvis Sigler, Wayne Hanson
 Houston, University of: A. A. White, Harry H. Fouke
 Jackson State College: Ulysses McPherson
 Lamar State College of Technology: James B. Higgins
 New Mexico State University: Carl R. Hall, Louis R. Henson
 Pan American College: John W. Hook, James A. Brooks
 Prairie View A&M College: Hoover J. Wright
 Rice University: Alan J. Chapman
 Southern Methodist University: Harold Jeskey, Jim Brock
 Southern University: Ulysses S. Jones, J. L. Hunt
 Texas, University of, Arlington: Claude R. Gilstrap
 Texas, University of, Austin: J. Neils Thompson, L. O. Morgan,
 Jones Ramsey
 Texas A&M University: Ogburn D. Butler
 Texas Christian University: Abe Martin
 Texas Tech University: J. William Davis
 Trinity University: Jess D. Carnes
 West Texas State University: W. Mitchell Jones, L. Jack Edmondson,
 Joseph E. Kerbel, Frank Kimbrough

District Seven

Arizona, University of: Marion R. Clausen, Louis A. Myers,
 Frank W. Soltys
 Arizona State University: Clyde B. Smith, Alfred Thomas, Jr.
 Brigham Young University: W. Floyd Millet, Milton F. Hartvigsen
 Colorado School of Mines: Francis E. Smiley, Fritz S. Brennecke
 Colorado State College: Don Chaloupka, Joe Lindahl
 Colorado State University: Harry E. Troxell, Thurman F. McGraw,
 Perry C. Moore
 Denver, University of: E. Hoyt Brawner
 Idaho, University of: Roland O. Byers, Edward T. Knecht
 Idaho State University: Milton W. Holt, Darold H. Chambers
 Montana, University of: Earl C. Lory, Walter C. Schwank
 Montana State University: Harry G. Cockrum, Gene Bourdet
 New Mexico, University of: Guido H. Daub, Peter McDavid

Northern Arizona University: Lyle Mullens, Ted Keck
 Regis College: Clarence H. Kellogg
 Southern Colorado State College: Houston C. Simms
 Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns,
 George C. McCarty
 U. S. Air Force Academy: Col. Philip J. Erdle, Hal Bateman,
 Frank Fischl, Col. Frank Merritt
 Utah, University of: James R. Jack
 Utah State University: Frank R. Williams
 Weber State College: Dale L. Gardner, Milton C. Mecham
 Western State College: Herbert J. Dorricott
 Wyoming, University of: Glenn J. Jacoby

District Eight

Boise State College: Lyle H. Smith, V. Dale Blickenstaff
 California, University of, Berkeley: Robley C. Williams,
 Paul W. Brechler
 California, University of, Davis: William L. Lakie
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Thomas L. Jacobs,
 J. D. Morgan
 California, University of, Riverside: Franklin A. Lindeburg,
 Frank T. Bingham
 California State College, Hayward: J. Lewis Comer
 California State College, Long Beach: Fred L. Miller, Bob Wuesthoff
 California State College, Los Angeles: Homer T. Beatty
 California State Polytechnic College, Pomona: Vernon L. Gregory
 California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo:
 Richard R. Harper, Fred L. Clogston
 Chapman College: Philip R. Theibert
 Chico State College: Rex R. Grossart
 Claremont-Harvey Mudd Colleges: Bill Arce
 Fresno State College: Cecil N. Coleman, George F. Ilg
 Hawaii, University of: Paul H. Durham
 Humboldt State College: Larry W. Kerker
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Dallas W. Norton,
 Michael Drakulich
 Oregon, University of: Raymond T. Ellickson, Leonard J. Casanova,
 Norv Ritchey
 Oregon State University: Kline R. Swygard, James G. Barratt
 Pacific, University of the: Cedric W. Dempsey
 Pepperdine College: Walter Glass
 Pomona College: Edward W. Malan
 Portland State University: Jesse L. Gilmore, J. Neil Stahley
 Redlands, University of: Ted C. Runner, Frank R. Serrao
 Sacramento State College: Fred B. Lewis
 San Diego State College: Ken Karr
 San Fernando Valley State College: Glenn W. Arnett, Arthur T. Taitt
 San Francisco, University of: Peter P. Peletta
 San Jose State College: Robert T. Bronzan
 Santa Clara University: George P. Malley
 Southern California, University of: E. John Larsen, Jesse T. Hill
 Stanford University: John W. Harbaugh, Charles A. Taylor
 Washington, University of: Joseph Kearney, Harry M. Cross
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Stan Bates

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: James H. Weaver, Marvin A. Francis,
Norvall Neve
Big Eight Conference: R. Wayne Duke, John Waldorf
Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, William R. Reed, Herm Rohrig
Big Sky Athletic Conference: Jack Friel
California Collegiate Athletic Association: Vernon L. Gregory
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: L. D. Smith
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Asa S. Bushnell,
Irving T. Marsh, William L. Rothenberg, George L. Shiebler,
Robert M. Whitelaw
Far Western Conference: William L. Lakie
Gulf State Conference: Stanley Galloway
Interstate Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Milton E. Weisbecker
Ivy Basketball League: James G. Holgate
Maine Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Stuart P. Haskell
Mid-American Conference: Robert C. James, Robert D. Peck, Jr.
Middle Atlantic States Conference: Willis J. Stetson
Midwest Conference: Clarence E. Von Eschen
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Roy F. Brown
Missouri Valley Conference: DeWitt T. Weaver, Larry Ensminger
New England College Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher
North Central Conference: Jack McClelland
North-East Collegiate Basketball League: James L. Bedell
Ohio Conference: Albert N. Smith
Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe
Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Cameron S. Deeds,
J. Kenneth Fagans
Pacific-8 Conference: Thomas J. Hamilton
Southeastern Conference: Arthur M. Coleman, Cliff Harper,
Elmore Hudgins
Southern Conference: Lloyd P. Jordan, J. Dallas Shirley
Southland Conference: Taylor Wilkins
Southwest Athletic Conference: Howard Grubbs, Wilbur Evans,
Cliff Speegle
Southwestern Athletic Conference: Charles D. Henry.
West Coast Athletic Conference: Walter Hawkins,
Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley
Western Athletic Conference: C. Wiles Hallock
Yankee Conference: J. O. Christian

Associated Members

Allen University: Thomas B. Nelson
Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell
Husson College: Del Merrill

Affiliated Members

International Association of Approved Basketball Officials:
Stewart C. Paxton

Visitors

Athletic Journal: Charlie Thorp
C. D. Chesley Company: C. D. Chesley, N. Harlan Slack, Jr.

Cotton Bowl: Field Scovell
Eastern Montana College: Frank H. Spechalske
Football Management Magazine: C. Raymond Amado
Football Publications: Lois Friddell
Gator Bowl Association: Norman Harrison, George R. Olsen,
Ted Emery
Guilford College: Herb Appenzeller
Memphis Memorial Stadium: Jerry Foley, H. S. Lewis
NCAA Films: Richard S. Snider
National Association of College Directors of Athletics:
Michael J. Cleary
National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations:
Clifford B. Fagan
National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Chester J. LaRoche,
Jimmie McDowell
National Directory of College Athletics: Ray Franks
Orange Bowl: Ben Benjamin, Bill Ward
Pasadena Bowl: Don Anthony, Bob Cheney, Gary Dorn,
William L. Leishman, John Nicoll
Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Stanley L. Hahn,
Lathrop K. Leishman, C. Lewis Edwards,
William H. Nicholas
Sacred Heart University: J. Donald Feeley
Sugar Bowl: Cliff Kern, Jr., Claude Simons, Fred Wolfe
Sun Bowl: Harrison D. Kohl
Tampa, University of: Sam M. Bailey
Tampa Sports Authority: Joseph J. Zalupski
Tel Ra Productions: W. Wallace Orr
Washburn University: Mike Sarkesian
West Coast Bowl Association: T. C. MacDonald, Jr.
Wisconsin State Universities: Fred Jacoby

Working Press

Arizona Star: Abe Chanin
Armed Forces Radio: Ken Allan
Associated Press: Bob Greene, Herschel Nissenson, Tom Seppy
Baltimore Sun: John Stewart
Boston Globe: Ernie Roberts
Chronicle of High Education: Tony Jones, Albert Logan
Kansas City Star: Bill Sims
Knoxville News-Sentinel: Tom Siler
Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
New York Times: Gordon S. White, Jr.
Oklahoman: Bob Hurt
Pasadena Independent Star-News: Joe Hendrickson
Philadelphia Enquirer: Frank Dolson
Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney
Sport Magazine: Dave Wolfe
Tucson Citizen: Carl Porter
United Press International: Sam Fogg
Washington Evening Star: Steve Guback, Dick Slay
Washington Post: Bob Addie
Station WNDD-FM: J. C. Burroughs

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, January 12, 1970

The opening session convened in the Presidential Ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D. C. at 10:10 a.m., Harry M. Cross, University of Washington, President of the Association, presiding.

1. OPENING REMARKS

President Cross: It is a pleasure to declare the 64th Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association open.

As you all know, the principal task of our Association is in the hands of the Council and the Executive Committee of the Association. (President Cross proceeded to introduce the members of the Council and Executive Committee.)

I want also to introduce to you William J. Flynn, director of Athletics at Boston College, who is the Secretary-Treasurer.

In addition, someone suggested that perhaps Mark Plant and I had some kind of flipflop operation going, in that I served as his parliamentarian and he is now acting as parliamentarian for us having served two years as our president.

I might repeat one of the remarks that Mark Plant made last year as president of our organization. One of the very important things is that we became acquainted with not only the members of the Council and Executive Committee, but the executive office staff in Kansas City and many men of our respective institutions who serve so willingly on the committees that we have. The organization depends upon that willingness to serve. The service has been wonderful and, as I am sure you know, effective.

I think it is also appropriate to identify the master of the whip, and once in a while we have an argument—Walter Byers, our executive director. [Applause]

You will notice in the Convention Program that there is a reception for the delegates which starts at 6:30 this evening. It is our privilege to have the Southeastern Conference and the Southern Conference as hosts of this reception, and I express on your behalf our thanks to those conferences for their assistance.

Tomorrow the annual Honors Luncheon will be held in this room. I am sure you will enjoy that event. You all probably know from stories in the NCAA NEWS that President Hovde of Purdue will receive the highest honor that the Association gives, the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

At the luncheon we will honor governors and cabinet members, and as a fitting climax to football's centennial year, the All-Time All-America Team will be in attendance. We also will have representatives of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners to honor.

2. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

I would like now to review briefly the voting instructions. On the back of the registration badge you will find the details. It will be

necessary to have the registration badge to vote and, in fact, for admission to the business sessions.

Primarily, you will indicate the action of the Convention by voice vote. If there appears to be dissent or division or if a count is required, we will call for a standing vote. After the Voting Committee has counted the votes, if the result is close, the Chair will authorize, or the delegates may request, a ballot vote.

An active or allied member of this Association is entitled to one vote. Members may have more than one representative, but if the voting delegate is present he shall cast the vote. In his absence an alternate is entitled to vote.

If a ballot vote is ordered the Chair will indicate the number of ballot to be used. The use of the yellow ballot will indicate an affirmative vote and the blue ballot a negative vote. In a ballot vote, it is not necessary that we vote in numerical sequence of the ballots.

Constitutional amendments require a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. Two-thirds majority is also required for action on official interpretations of constitutional amendments. Bylaws amendments require a simple majority of the members present and voting and official interpretations of the Bylaws require a simple majority of the members present and voting.

As I mentioned before, Marcus Plant of the University of Michigan, who presided over our Convention in 1968 and 1969, is going to serve as our parliamentarian.

Marcus L. Plant (University of Michigan): The bulk of the business will consist of amendments to the Constitution and to the Bylaws, and both the Constitution and Bylaws have special provisions with respect to amending these proposed amendments.

The provisions for amending the Constitution and the Bylaws are set forth on page 14 of the NCAA MANUAL.

A proposed amendment to the Constitution may be amended at the Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting; provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the Constitutional provision to be amended—the proposed amendment may be amended within the scope of the notice that was sent out, but it may not be changed to enlarge it—and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the final business session of the Convention.

If anyone has an amendment to an amendment which he would like to have presented it should be in Bill Flynn's hands prior to 1 p.m. tomorrow. The purpose of that is to give us an opportunity to reproduce the amendment so you will have it in writing on Wednesday.

The same provisions apply to amendments to the Bylaws.

President Cross: As you registered, you received a copy of the Annual Reports. I call your attention to the respective reports that appear in that volume. We have the reports of the Vice-Presidents by Districts on page 9 and following. The reports of the rules committees are, too, worthy of your attention, starting on page 41 and going to page 49, and the other committees starting on page 49 and going to page 57.

You will also notice there for your reading the minutes of the Council and the Executive Committee. They are in fact rather interesting

and give you quite a feel of the tasks that come before our Association and what we do from time to time.

(The motion was regularly made and seconded that the reports of the Vice-Presidents and committees be received.)

3. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President and Gentlemen: The Constitution requires that the Secretary-Treasurer submit to the annual Convention a report of all receipts and disbursements during the preceding fiscal year which ended August 31. I also will provide information on the status of the Association's membership.

Francis A. Wright & Company of Kansas City, Missouri, has performed an audit of the Association's financial status for the period of September 1, 1968, through August 31, 1969. This report will be found on pages 133-143 of the 1968-69 Annual Reports, which is available to all delegates at the registration desk. The financial examination by Francis A. Wright & Company was supplemented by audit reports furnished by certified public accountants in New York City and Phoenix, Arizona, who reviewed the financial operations of the National Collegiate Sports Services and College Athletics Publishing Service.

This Association's total assets now amount to \$1,469,760 as compared to \$1,224,374 for the 1967-68 fiscal year. Most of this increase was in cash and a large measure can be attributed to the Association's first million dollar basketball tournament.

The general income for the year amounted to \$741,699, an increase of approximately \$177,000 over the previous year. The general operating expense of the Association amounted to \$501,940 as compared to \$410,794 a year ago. During the past year the Association increased its staff, budgeted for additional meetings and incurred considerably more expense in connection with the annual Convention primarily due to the Honors Luncheon. And, of course, inflation took its toll.

It may be interesting for you to know that the Association's executive office was responsible for handling \$2,317,310 in cash receipts and disbursements during the past fiscal year, which is indicative of the Association's expanding program.

The Association has two types of reserves, the funded cash reserve and the investment trust.

The funded cash reserve is covered in full by cash or immediately marketable securities and it currently amounts to \$95,766.

The Association's investment trust was divided into two accounts consisting of government securities, corporation stocks and corporate bonds. Our investment program has undergone a consolidation and you will learn more about it from the Executive Committee report. The total amount of the investment trust is \$394,897. This represents a decrease of approximately \$38,000 during the past year and is attributable to the downward trend of the stock market.

Association membership continues to increase and now totals 721 members. There are 626 active members, 40 allied members, 30 associated members and 25 affiliated members.

New members which joined during the past year, including five institutions that transferred from associate to active membership, are as follows:

District 2

Drew University, Madison, New Jersey
Point Park College, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
York College, York, Pennsylvania

District 3

Lambuth College, Jackson, Tennessee
Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia
University of Maryland, Baltimore
University of North Carolina, Wilmington
Saint Leo College, St. Leo, Florida
University of South Alabama, Mobile
Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Mississippi

District 4

Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio
Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana
Purdue University, Calumet Campus, Hammond, Indiana
St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Illinois
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio

District 6

Houston Baptist College, Houston, Texas

District 7

Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona

District 8

Boise State College, Boise, Idaho

Associate

Christian Brothers College, Memphis, Tennessee
Dallas Baptist College, Dallas, Texas
Missouri Western College, St. Joseph, Missouri
University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Pennsylvania
University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Allied

Pacific Coast Athletic Association

Affiliated

United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association.

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, including the printed audit, and I move that it be received.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

President Cross: It is interesting in the membership roll to find during the year how many colleges have applied for and satisfied the requirements of membership. Yesterday at the Council meeting the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame was accepted into affiliate membership and the University of Alabama at Birmingham and Luther Rice College, Alexandria, Virginia, were accepted into associate membership.

4. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Jesse T. Hill (University of Southern California): Mr. President and Members of the Association: The NCAA Executive Committee is charged with the responsibility of administering the Association's business and financial affairs, including the conduct of NCAA meets and tournaments. The Committee is composed of the Association's president, secretary-treasurer, vice-president-at-large and seven members selected by the Council. It is my privilege to report to you today on behalf of the Executive Committee.

The gentleman who delivered this report last year, H. B. Lee, resigned from the Committee following the April meeting. The Council appointed Wayne Duke, commissioner of the Big Eight Conference, to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Lee's resignation.

The subject of money always provokes an interesting discussion and the Executive Committee was of the opinion that it would be worthwhile to determine how we spend our dollars in the area of intercollegiate athletics. The Association has undertaken an extensive cost survey. I am certain that many of the athletic directors in the audience have spent hours completing the detailed forms requesting information about your institutions' athletic operations. The survey is designed to provide an in depth analysis of revenue and expenditures by NCAA member institutions. A research team at the University of Missouri will complete the study and the final report will be distributed this spring.

The Association has been fortunate in recent years to accumulate revenue which has been invested through trust accounts established with two Kansas City banks. During the past year, the Association asked T. Leroy Martin, faculty athletic representative at Northwestern University and one who possesses expertise in the area of investment and finance, to review the Association's investment program. As a result of Mr. Martin's findings, an Investment Study Committee was appointed to analyze the NCAA's investment policies and come forward with appropriate recommendations. The Committee did its work well and as a result the Association's investment program has been modernized to generate income to offset inflation and still maintain financial stability. It has been placed under the stewardship of one trust company.

The Investment Study Committee was also requested to investigate the feasibility of constructing a building in Kansas City, Missouri, to house the Association's executive headquarters. The Executive Committee believes that such a project is in the best interests of the Association financially and administratively. It is anticipated that the College Athletics Publishing Service in Phoenix would be consolidated in Kansas City in this connection. We hope that the NCAA will have its own building by 1973 or 1974.

During the past year, the Association in conjunction with the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports promoted the National Summer Youth Sports Program. The program was administered by the NCAA at no cost to the government and proved to be most successful. A total of 100 institutions in 54 cities participated and provided a sports program for 43,000 boys and girls. I can speak with first-hand knowledge inasmuch as my institution, the University of Southern California, was one of the institutions that participated. It should be

noted that the total financial contribution amounted to 4.9 million dollars with approximately one million three hundred thousand dollars contributed by the participating institutions and \$62,000 by the NCAA. A grant from the federal government provided slightly less than three million dollars. It is interesting to note, especially in this city, that the institutions involved in the program managed their money in such a manner that approximately ten per cent of the grant was returned to the government.

The Association was fortunate to gain the services of James H. Wilkinson, who served as NSYSP national program director. Jim deserves considerable credit for making the program a success and his background as an outstanding high school coach and administrator served him well.

In the area of meets and tournaments, the Executive Committee had another busy year. Some of the more important actions included the establishment of the National Collegiate Water Polo and Volleyball Championships. The Executive Committee also approved a permanent scheduling formula which should be of assistance to member institutions and conferences in the future planning. The decathlon will be added as an event in the Association's track and field championships in June and the Executive Committee is sponsoring an amendment to establish a National Collegiate Lacrosse Championship, effective with the 1970-71 academic year.

Based on the recommendation of the College Football Committee, the Executive Committee approved the establishment of two new post-season football games expressly for the NCAA's smaller members. This required dividing the Association's College Division into two groups. Approximately half of the College Division membership was eligible for the established regional football championships and the remainder were potential participants in the two new games, the Knute Rockne Bowl and the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl. Randolph-Macon defeated Bridgeport in the first Rockne Bowl and Wittenberg was victorious over William Jewell in the first Stagg Bowl. The two new games were well received and are important additions to the Association's competitive program.

The Executive Committee is authorized to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Association's Constitution and Bylaws.

The revisions in the Executive Regulations that were made during the past year may be noted on pages 41 to 43 of the Convention Program. Probably the most important change concerns entries in NCAA championship events. You will note that henceforth any active member must be paid up and in good standing and must have certified that it is operating in conformance with the 1,600 legislation as of September 1 to be eligible to compete in the fall championships, by December 1 to be eligible for the winter championships and by March 1 to be eligible for the spring championships.

No report of the Executive Committee would be complete this year without complimenting the Committee for the Advancement of Intercollegiate Football, the Association's public relations department, National Collegiate Sports Services and all Association members who participated in celebrating College Football's Centennial year. Special mention should go to ABC Sports and Chevrolet. It was a great effort

involving many talented people. Public awareness increased in-person attendance and considerably higher television ratings attest the success of the Centennial promotion. Now that so many people are interested in college football, it is incumbent upon all of us to continue to promote this great sport and not rest on our laurels waiting for the bicentennial celebration.

Mr. President, I move that the report of the Executive Committee be accepted and approved, including the detailed accounting of our activities as recorded in the 1968-69 Annual Reports. The revisions of Executive Regulations (pages A-29 through A-31) will be presented to the Convention for vote on Wednesday.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

President Cross: We are proceeding rather rapidly in the investment studies and also in the building for our national headquarters. The Executive Committee decided to appoint a permanent committee to watch closely in both Association areas. Marcus Plant of Michigan is a member. Bill Ketz, Vice-President At-Large, will be chairman of the committee. The Secretary-Treasurer is a member, so Bill Flynn had no choice.

I would like to put a note to the part of the report dealing with the National Summer Youth Sports Program. It was my privilege to attend the Council meeting in October when that report was made and the NSYSP film was shown. All the institutions which participated in the program have copies of that film. If you have not seen it, I urge that you do. Some of the details of the program are illustrated on the bulletin boards in the hall outside. This film frankly sent the chills up and down my spine. I think it is a very inspiring thing and the more people who see it and are aware of this program the better it will be next year. The Association can very properly take a great deal of pride in this program.

5. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

Samuel E. Barnes (Howard University): Mr. President and Members of the Association: In accordance with the Constitution, the establishment and direction of the general policy of the Association in the interim between conventions is committed to a Council of eighteen members. It is a privilege for me to present the yearly report of the NCAA Council at the 64th Annual Convention of the Association.

Your Council worked diligently during the past year attempting to develop policies and recommendations which would satisfactorily and equitably answer many of the complex problems confronting intercollegiate athletics today. As someone said recently, "There are no simple problems anymore."

One problem currently confronting intercollegiate athletics is finances. Unfortunately, the solution is not a simple one and we need all of the talent and resources of this Association to meet the challenge of the 70's.

The Council was privileged to review the problem of finances with Willis Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, who appeared at the Council's October meeting as a representative of the Committee on Long Range Planning. Mr. Tate expressed deep concern about the

cost of conducting an intercollegiate athletic program. In his opinion, the greatest threat to intercollegiate athletics today is rising costs especially since there is a stabilization in the amount of income an institution may expect from intercollegiate athletics. He mentioned that there is considerable competition for the dollars that are used to support higher education and proceeded to discuss several proposals advanced by the Committee on Long Range Planning.

The Association has sponsored an exhaustive survey designed to analyze the expense involved in conducting an intercollegiate athletic program. I am certain that the final report will be enlightening and hopefully it will prove helpful to future planning.

As a result of the preliminary study by the Committee on Long Range Planning, the Council has appointed a special committee to investigate the feasibility of drafting legislation which would limit the number of initial scholarships or grants an institution may award on an annual basis (if athletic ability is taken into consideration in making the award) and to consider the establishment of a national need formula. The committee, to serve under the chairmanship of Secretary-Treasurer Flynn, has been given a substantial task and the Council looks forward to receiving its report later this year.

More immediately, legislation has been proposed to this Convention which is designed to eliminate expenses and bring more realism into the area of recruiting. This topic will be treated in detail at the Round Table session scheduled for this afternoon.

Perhaps a distinct start toward solving the current financial problem would be to control institutional, conference and regional pride to the extent that we join together and help ourselves.

During the past year, the Association published read-easy football and basketball rules, designed to help the layman better understand the game. The idea proved popular. Perhaps we can apply the same idea to NCAA rules. Your Council believes that a recodification of the Association's Constitution, Bylaws and Official Interpretations would be of help to the membership and I call your attention to the resolution on page 46 of the Convention Program. The resolution is self-explanatory and the membership will have an opportunity to vote on any pertinent changes at next year's Convention.

Our distinguished immediate past president, Mark Plant, is scheduled to lead a discussion during the afternoon's round table session concerning the changing status of amateur rules. The Council has been concerned at what appears to be an eroding of the interpretation of amateurism by some other sports organizations. The result is that we find that the permissive policies of other amateur sports organizations are contradictory to NCAA amateur requirements. During the past year the Council adopted interpretations designed to clarify the application of Constitution 3 to such sports as golf and tennis. It was interesting to note that there was some criticism by other groups of these interpretations which simply are consistent with what is required of students who choose to participate in other sports, such as football and basketball.

The Council has found it increasingly necessary to rely on special committees to concentrate in areas which require detailed investigation. We have been fortunate that individuals have been most cooperative in responding to the Council's call for assistance.

One such group is the Special Committee on Junior College Relations, which includes representatives of the National Junior College Athletic Association and the California Junior College Association. This committee was charged to develop machinery to correct abuses in the so-called "farming out" practices. I will not dwell in detail on the Committee's legislative recommendations, but I do suggest that you be present for the discussion about junior college relations at this afternoon's Round Table session.

The Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements again performed yeoman service during the past year. The results of a recent study indicate that the previously developed national tables are still valid as a national standard. Almost two-thirds of the NCAA membership utilize the national tables.

The chairman of the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements, Jack Fuzak of Michigan State, and the Committee's liaison officer from the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Ken Vickery of Clemson University, are available to any member here who wishes to consult with them concerning any aspect of the 1,600 administration.

The Council is concerned that the American student does not appear to have a reasonable opportunity to compete in intercollegiate ice hockey. From present reports, the popularity of the sport has increased substantially in recent years and there are more young people engaged in ice hockey in this country than ever before. At the intercollegiate level, however, many of the college teams are composed primarily (and in some instances entirely) of Canadian students.

A committee was appointed to study the problem and came forth with recommendations which have been distributed to the Association's ice hockey playing membership for reaction and comment.

It should be noted that the special ice hockey committee expressed a great deal of respect for the Canadian as an athlete, student and individual. The majority of the Committee expressed serious concern, however, that the United States athlete's opportunity of participating in intercollegiate ice hockey is being diluted greatly by the ever-increasing number of Canadians recruited by NCAA member institutions with ice hockey in mind.

The Council has not made a decision as to whether it should support or recommend legislation relative to ice hockey. One positive gain is the increased awareness of the situation which has stimulated worthwhile and constructive discussion among those institutions sponsoring an intercollegiate ice hockey program.

Baseball is another sport which received attention from the Council during the past year. A special committee was established to determine whether there should be a limitation on the playing and practicing seasons for intercollegiate baseball. Again, the Council has not made a final decision on the matter.

The Council announced to the membership following its meeting in October of 1967 that it would not approve out-of-season basketball competition other than for Olympic or Pan American Games participation. The matter was reviewed and the Council's position approved by the membership in January, 1968. The Council reaffirmed this position in April, 1969, as a result of the recommendation of the Basketball Federation's Executive Committee.

The strategy adopted initially by the Basketball Federation proved to be effective. In January of last year the international basketball organization, known as FIBA, sent an investigating team to the United States and recommended the establishment of a board to supervise and approve this country's international basketball participation, exclusive of the Olympic games. As a result, the International Basketball Board of the United States was established providing for equal representation of the Basketball Federation and the Amateur Athletic Union. There have been three preliminary meetings to date and if the new organization appears to be functioning properly I assume that the Council will receive a favorable recommendation soon from the Basketball Federation concerning future NCAA policy relative to out-of-season basketball competition.

In brief, the Federation Movement is progressing most satisfactorily. The United States Gymnastics Federation has become the dominant force in the sport of gymnastics in the United States and currently is a member of the United States Gymnastics Commission, which is responsible for international competition as far as United States participation is concerned.

The United States Track & Field Federation program has grown considerably in the past year. The USTFF has undertaken sponsorship of several indoor meets and there has been renewed emphasis in developing more active state programs primarily concerned with the developmental aspects of the sport.

The United States Wrestling Federation is still in its embryonic stages, but its future is encouraging. The Federation recently obtained the services of Myron Roderick, a highly successful wrestling coach at Oklahoma State University, to serve as its executive director.

The Baseball Federation sponsored a team which participated in an international tournament in the Dominican Republic during the past year. The team was confronted with many obstacles, but performed most creditably.

In Olympic matters, the Association continues to find considerable fault with the United States Olympic Committee. The main basis for criticism is the USOC regulation which provides that the international franchise holder shall have a majority vote on all games committees. Such a regulation enables the international franchise holder to name the coach, manager, committee chairman and, in general, control the games committees without regard to the contribution of the NCAA's member colleges, high schools and junior colleges. During the past few years the Association has sponsored legislation designed to eliminate this regulation but has been defeated by those organizations which are primarily concerned with perpetuating their own self interests.

An example of our frustrations in the Olympic Committee is the fact that for the first time in history no nominee of the NCAA was named to a coaching or managerial position on the Olympic Track and Field team.

On several occasions there have been suggestions that the NCAA withdraw from the Olympic Committee. It is the recommendation of the current NCAA Olympic Committee, however, that the Association continue to participate actively in the USOC in order to best serve the interests of the Association's membership and the Olympic movement.

The Council, at the request of many members, has approved a stan-

dard financial aid form. Please understand that the Council is not approving or recommending adoption of a standard form, but desires to provide a suitable document which conforms to NCAA rules and regulations.

In conclusion, let me state that your Council has been pleased at the growth of intercollegiate athletics during the past decade and its increasing popularity. As we look forward to the challenges of the 1970's, we should review the basic purpose of the National Collegiate Athletic Association which may be found in Constitution, Article 2: "The NCAA is dedicated to the stimulation and improvement of programs to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation as a recreational pursuit, and athletic excellence through competitive intramural and intercollegiate programs."

We have a right to be proud of the tradition which this Association has established in the regulation and promotion of intercollegiate athletics, but we must also be aware that as men who are committed to youth and sports we must continuously rededicate ourselves to achieving the basic purpose of this Association.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Council I wish to thank you and your fellow officer, Mr. Flynn, for your excellent guidance during the past year. I call the Convention's attention to the record of the Council's 1968 meetings as contained in the Annual Reports. I now move that the report of the Council for 1969 be received and approved.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

President Cross: There are two proposals in the Convention Program which are designed to set the effective date of legislation as September 1 following the Convention.

It probably would be desirable to have these amendments acted upon first, so that all later amendments or actions that you may take will then relate to this particular date. I will ask at the time of the meeting on Wednesday for consent to adjust the stated order.

It is well to anticipate another thing. It is important here also to require some identification of the actions the Convention takes on Wednesday which may have need to be effective immediately rather than effective on September 1, as in the past.

6. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

John E. Faber (University of Maryland): Mr. President and Members of the Association, the Committee on Memorial Resolutions was composed of William Exum, Kentucky State College; John J. Horgan, Seton Hall University, and myself. The Committee presents the following resolution:

"Be it resolved: That we, the delegates to the 64th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association pay sincere and heartfelt tribute to the following members of our Association who dedicated their lives to the betterment of youth and the cause of intercollegiate athletics and who have passed away since our last national convention:

Thomas Anderson, Occidental College

John Bennington, Michigan State University

Martin Bezyack, United States Air Force Academy

Albert Britt, Knox College

Andrew Davis Bruce, University of Houston
George Daniel, Ohio Athletic Conference
E. A. Diddle, Western Kentucky University
Fritz Febel, University of Buffalo
Mitchell J. Gary, Western Michigan University
Harold M. Gore, University of Massachusetts
Elvin R. Handy, University of Notre Dame
Harvey Harman, National Football Hall of Fame
W. Don Harrison, University of Pittsburgh
Burton Ingwersen, University of Illinois
William N. James, Trinity University
Thomas E. Jones, University of Wisconsin
Albert Kennedy, University of Kansas
Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
Andrew Kerr, Colgate University
Kassian Kovalcheck, Duquesne University
Stanley Lowe, Marquette University
Jerry Mattingly, University of Evansville
A. Paul Menton, Mason-Dixon Conference
James Needles, University of San Francisco
Eugene Nixon, Pomona College
Howard Ortner, Cornell University
Kenneth Patrick, Hamilton College
Arthur L. Powell, University of Buffalo
Ellsworth Richardson, Amherst College
John S. Robinson, East Tennessee State University
Joseph Rochenbach, Rochester State College
Robert Rolfe, Dartmouth College
E. L. Romney, Utah State University
John F. Rourke, Colgate University
Louis E. Skender, Duquesne University
Charles Smith, San Diego State College
Ernest Smith, Portland University
R. Victor Stout, Boston University
Gus K. Tebell, University of Virginia
George Terry, University of South Carolina
Donald Usry, United States Air Force Academy
Robert Vaughan, Wabash College
Otto Vogel, University of Iowa
Ray E. Watts, Baldwin-Wallace College
Frank M. Wetzler, LaSalle College
Alan W. White, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Robert White, Howard University
Ivan B. Williamson, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Bowden Wyatt, University of Tennessee
Edward G. Zanfrini, Princeton University

And be it further resolved: That the officers of this association extend our expression of tribute and sympathy to the families of our

former associates, with the assurance that they are esteemed in memory and their contributions are valued.

Mr. President, I respectfully request that the members of this Convention stand in a moment of silent tribute to these men, our departed colleagues.

(The assembly then rose and stood for one moment in silent tribute to the memory of their departed colleagues.)

(The session then adjourned at 11:15 a.m.)

COMBINED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE

Monday Afternoon, January 12, 1970

The session convened at two o'clock in the Presidential Ballroom, William J. Flynn, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer and representing Boston College, presiding.

Chairman Flynn: As listed in your program bulletin this afternoon we have three round table discussions and we have added a fourth item by popular demand. There have been so many people interested in seeing the film on the National Summer Youth Sports Program which runs for twenty-eight and a half minutes that we have added it to the program, and after the three round tables we will have the film in this room, so if you have not seen it, I would suggest that you stay and see it.

The first round table discussion has to do with Junior College Relations, and we have four outstanding people here to bring this to you. Mr. Rix Snyder, who is a faculty representative of Stanford University and is also chairman of the Special Committee on Junior College Relations, will act as discussion leader for this part of the program.

(Rixford K. Snyder assumed the chair.)

Junior College Relations

Chairman Snyder: Mr. Flynn, Faculty Athletic Representatives and Directors of Athletics: I am pleased to present the members of the panel who have been asked to discuss the topic of Junior College Relations.

They are: Mr. Kenneth McFall, faculty athletic representative of Bowling Green State University; Mr. George Killian, the National Junior College Athletic Association, and Mr. A. M. Coleman, commissioner of the Southeastern Conference.

We were to have had a fourth member, Mr. Lloyd E. Messersmith, executive director of the California Junior College Association, but unfortunately on January 7 he was taken ill and his physician has instructed him not to fly for a period of some time and so he was unable to join us.

Mr. Killian, Mr. McFall, Mr. Messersmith and I have all been members of the Special NCAA Committee on Junior College Relations. We met first in September 1968 and discussed the junior college movement, its philosophy, its program, and particularly its need to relate to athletics.

It was proposed by this committee, among other points, that the topic of junior college relations be included in a round table session at some future NCAA Convention. We also recommended that the committee become a standing or permanent one.

I have asked Mr. Killian to start off the discussion by commenting on the junior college, its philosophy, its program, and particularly as it relates to athletics. He will also talk about the current effects of

the 1.600 rule on the junior college and the abuses that are taking place under this rule as he sees them. I should add that Mr. Killian has very kindly consented to take over two of the topics Mr. Messersmith was to have discussed so he is taking the entire role as far as the junior college presentation is concerned.

George Killian (National Junior College Athletic Association): It is my pleasure to be here this afternoon. I cannot very well speak for Mr. Messersmith because he is not included in our national organization nor are very many of the California schools.

Our national association has a membership of 472.

As Rix has said, this committee has met on numerous occasions and one of the topics was the philosophy of the junior college. I might bore you if I attempted to go into lengthy discussion on the philosophy of what we are trying to do. However, I would be remiss if I did not try to clarify a few points along this line.

First, the community college and junior college level are all one and the same. They have very, very many different kinds of names, but they all have pretty much the same philosophy. That philosophy is an open-door philosophy. Under this open-door philosophy our educational programs are available to people of all different kinds, different attitudes, interests, achievements and ages.

We are sometimes referred to in the field of higher education as the institution that takes away the fringes, the institution that takes the marginal student, and last week in the paper it was said we also have some marginal schools. We also take the individual whose turn it is to sit on the ground. Some of the things that people say about us are that we have small classes and so on down the list. We are close to home. Our tuition is low. Gentlemen, when we look at all these things, whatever they are, we are extremely proud that we are able to serve or play this part in American higher education.

I think most of you are familiar with the parallel type of program run in pretty much all of our community colleges. This is the first two years of the four-year program. However, in discussing the eligibility role concerning our students, there is one area in which the four-year administrator is not very knowledgeable, and that is in the area of terminal education. Gentlemen, statistically, one third of the people who enter the community colleges transfer, which means that two-thirds of that vast number never go beyond the community college.

I have recommended to many of the coaches in the NCAA that they purchase this little book, *THIS IS THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE*, written by Dr. Edmund Gleazer, who is executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

We feel many of the marginal students are getting their last chance when you take him out of our institution before he either graduates or has spent two years there. In many of these terminal occupational programs we are training him for a specific task in life. Once he gets into this specific task he can then return to our colleges for years and years and years and take additional course work which would aid him in that particular occupation for which he has been trained.

In fact, if you read Dr. Gleazer's book, on page 53 you find this quote: "The education of the boy in the community college is much broader than that of preparing the student for the upper division of the four-year institution. This is not in fact its chief assignment."

He is saying very bluntly that our principal assignment in the field of education is not training the student for the four-year college.

"For more than half of the students, the community college will represent the final formal educational activities before they assume responsibilities of citizenship, family and occupation."

In studies by Garrison and Ross, I came across this statement and conclusion that the weaker students—and what I think of as the weaker student in relationship to athletics is the nonpredictor—in both subject matter and scholastic phase remain in the junior college for more than two years before they transfer in order to catch up with their classmates.

They went further to observe that a student who stays in the junior college for his full two years tends to be much more successful when he transfers.

I don't want to stir up any problems here today, but one of the things I have come across in my observation in how this relates to the non-predictor, the 1.600 and the B average, is that it is possible in our field of education to go to one of our schools and take 24 hours of work and never have any course in English or sociology. We know that it is possible. There is nothing we can do about it.

I am not here to fight one way or the other, but there are coaches who are saying that many of these boys who come from our schools cannot cut the mustard academically in the four-year colleges. I have been feuding with one of the college basketball coaches who says that.

Before I sit down I want to point out one more thing and you can shoot your cannons at me. When you receive one of our students into your college you are saying that this youngster meets the requirements academically of the students on your campus. When he enrolls in your college, gentlemen, he is your student, and he is not ours any longer. If he doesn't cut the mustard at your institution, please don't tell everybody what a bad job we are doing in the junior college because it is not our responsibility. You have accepted him and you have said that he is now capable of doing the work on your college campus.

We think to be responsive to the junior college, the Committee will accept this piece of legislation that is before you because we think it is advantageous to you. We know it is advantageous to us. We feel it is in line with the higher education program. We would like to keep the students with us as long as possible, because we have many, many marginal students and these are the ones to whom the legislation is appropriate.

Chairman Snyder: Our second speaker is Kenneth McFall who will discuss the proposed legislation relating to the junior college which was recommended by our committee to the Council, which is recommended by the Council in a somewhat slightly modified form and is being sponsored at this Convention by that body.

Kenneth H. McFall (Bowling Green State University): If you will turn to page 36 of the 1969 NCAA Manual you will find Bylaw 4-1-(d) concerning transfers from junior colleges. As it now reads, a junior college student-athlete who does not predict 1.600 after graduation from high school, but transfers to a four-year institution after 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a "B" average from a junior college; or a predictor with 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours with a 2.500 point average or

higher, are immediately eligible for postseason meets and tournaments.

Proposed amendment No. 29 (pages A-14 and A-15) retains the same eligibility requirements for predictors—transfer with 24 semester hours and 36 quarter hours—but requires that nonpredictors graduate from junior college or present a minimum of 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit and have spent at least two academic years, excluding summer sessions, at a junior college.

Adoption of this will require revision of Official Interpretation 112 (see page A-24) to require a nonpredictor to have spent at least two academic years, excluding summer sessions, at the junior college to be eligible for NCAA events.

Also, an amendment is proposed to Bylaw 4-6-(b) (see page A-16) to require institutions to limit their initial scholarship or grant-in-aid awards—this is important—to predictors who transfer with 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours from the junior college. Nonpredictors must be graduated from the junior college or transfer with 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours and have completed two years in residence at the junior college.

That is a quick rundown of what the legislation means. In other words, for an institution to be eligible for NCAA events it cannot have a person come out for the squad if he is not eligible under this legislation.

It was a very interesting experience for me to sit with this group of men. There were about ten of us, several from the junior colleges and several from the universities and colleges. We sincerely believe this legislation is needed in the NCAA if we are to prevent some of the things that were considered by this committee as poor practices, such as having a student who is not a predictor attend a junior college with the guarantee that he will get a "B" average in the first 24 credit hours.

Chairman Snyder: Our third speaker on the panel was not a member of our committee, so he represents a sort of transition from our committee to this body. He is A. M. Coleman, commissioner of the Southeastern Conference, and what he has done in preparation for this round table is to make a survey of a number of key people in his conference area, as I understand it, and ask questions of them. He has their responses, and I have asked him to present some of those to you at this time.

A. M. Coleman (Southeastern Conference): Thank you. I was asked to be a member of this panel. I told them I had little experience in this particular situation and had had up to now very few junior college transfers, although there have been some shiftings. I told them I did not think I would be a good panel member. They said, "We always like to have a know-nothing member so we can confuse the audience." [Laughter]

I did make a survey, but it was not restricted to our area. I picked out a few people across the country, and asked them four questions to get their reactions to important questions regarding this particular legislation.

No. 1. Do you like the present NCAA transfer rule as it applies to junior colleges? Please point out its strengths and weaknesses.

About 26 people answered and the majority did not approve of the present rules. I will give you three quick answers to that particular

question which pretty well summarize all the answers.

(a) Its predicate is a kind of uniformity in the functions, character and quality of junior colleges which does not exist throughout the country (or even regionally).

(b) The rule lends itself to systematic "farming out" of prospects not academically or athletically prepared for immediate admission to a four-year school.

(c) The present transfer rule, as it applies to junior colleges, has been outdated by the legislation which permits freshmen to play varsity athletics in all sports except football and basketball upon admission to the institution. Why should bona fide college students, who are attending junior college and doing college work, have to put in two years residence before competing? The exception which allows a junior college student to transfer with 24 hours of "B" work or has maintained a minimum grade point average of 2.500 provided he predicted a 1.600 is a step toward more fair treatment of the situation, but still the junior college student is being discriminated against.

Question No. 2 was: Would you approve of the new legislation that is being proposed at this Convention? The answers were a qualified "yes." Those questioned were people who represented a number of different institutions and they were well qualified, both from the academic as well as the athletic standpoint, to speak on the proposed legislation as it applies to junior college transfers.

Out of this number perhaps 50 per cent were wholeheartedly for the legislation. The others thought it was mandatory, so to speak. In other words, they did not want to approve wholeheartedly this legislation. They were not for the transfer rules as they are now and they would not be wholeheartedly for the transfer rules that might be adopted by this Convention.

Then I asked another question, because it was suggested over and over and I am sure this has been a question in your committee meetings: What arguments would you offer for or against the "graduation requirement," that is, the rule that many conferences have had over the years for junior college student-athletes?

You might guess that 40 per cent approximately were for that particular rule and about 60 per cent were against it. Responses to this question were:

(a) I would favor the "graduation requirement" for all junior college student-athletes. I feel it would be more fair to the junior colleges who recruit athletes on the basis of two years and it might eliminate some of the "shenanigans" involved with one-year students.

(b) I fully support the graduation requirement because this would at least insure that a student attending a junior college would complete a normal course of study comparable to others to fulfill the requirements for a degree. "Bandit" junior colleges would be less likely to graduate a student rather than permit him to take 48 hours of any kind of work because their accreditation could be jeopardized.

(c) The only recommendation I would make if the graduation

requirement is not acceptable is that the 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit may only contain the total number of physical education courses which are required in the first two years at the transferring institution.

I have a number of other responses and reactions, but I think we have about taken up enough time. Thank you very much. [Applause]

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): I would like to ask a question concerning proposed Amendment No. 32. Does it mean that a nonpredictor who enters a junior college can only be eligible after he has spent two years in the particular institution? I would suggest that be changed.

I will cite a specific case. A nonpredictor goes to a junior college for one semester, and after that one semester he transfers to a senior college. Obviously, he is not eligible at that point. He stays in the senior college for one full year and at the end of the full year in the senior college he now has, we will say, a 3.00 point average. Does he qualify for eligibility at the end of the first year in the senior college?

Mr. McFall: Frankly, I think you have been misled. It is my reaction to this legislation that after a student once enters as a nonpredictor in the junior college and transfers to a four-year institution he has to serve a period of time and he has to accumulate in that institution a 1.600 average to be eligible for a grant.

Mr. Grubbs: If I understood you correctly the answer was "yes." If a boy has been in junior college for one year and goes to a senior college for another full year and has had the academic performance he would be eligible in the fourth semester in the senior college.

Mr. McFall: You are talking about something the Committee did not study. You should ask the Eligibility Committee or the Council for an official interpretation.

As far as we understand it, he has to have a 1.600 average in the four-year institution where he wants to become eligible. It can be either junior-related or the preceding year. And also he has to have spent a year in that institution before he is eligible to get a grant-in-aid or scholarship.

John Kane (University of Arkansas): With reference to the same amendment, what about the student in the junior college who graduates, but did not spend two academic years of residence? Maybe he went to two summer schools.

Mr. McFall: My interpretation is that an individual who is a graduate of a junior college falls in the first category.

Chairman Snyder: As chairman of the special committee I have attempted to remain neutral throughout this session, but I think I can briefly summarize for you what turned out to be the unanimous opinion of all of the members of this Committee on Junior College Relations, as follows:

First of all, the Committee believes that the proposed legislation is in the interest of better relations between junior colleges and the members of the NCAA.

Secondly, the proposed legislation would improve the over-all academic preparation and possibly the historical preparation of students transferring from junior colleges who were nonpredictors at the time they enrolled in the junior colleges.

Finally, proposed legislation hopefully would diminish at least one charge of professionalism that might be leveled against members of the NCAA.

[Chairman Flynn resumed the chair.]

Chairman Flynn: It is my pleasure to introduce our next speaker who is the immediate past-president of our organization. He is a faculty representative, law professor and also a member of the Executive Committee.

Amateurism—Changes Not To Be Made

Marcus L. Plant (University of Michigan): Gentlemen, I undertook this assignment with some trepidation as to the nature of the subject matter, and had I known I was going to be following such important and interesting discussions as we have had I would have felt less sure of myself.

In approaching this task I shall take as my text the verse from the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Chapter 6, Verse 21: "For where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also."

When I mentioned to a colleague of mine that I was going to participate in a discussion of amateurism, he put on a cynical smile and said, "What is it?" Actually it was a rather tame reaction because if there is any way to start a fight in a faculty lounge or faculty club it is to open up a discussion of athletic amateurism. The cynicism is a somewhat common reaction, however, and it is often effected by persons who consider themselves highly sophisticated.

Certain sports columnists and commentators when they are short of material like to fill in with the denunciation of the hypocrisy of the concept. The idea is a residual of the remnants of the nineteenth century English classes. It is oversimplified.

A professor acquaintance of mine once urged me that the colleges should make up their collective minds as to whether they want their athletes to be amateurs or professionals and start legislation to bring it about.

The sermon has taken on certain moral overtones and overtones of purity or impurity.

I have a letter here in my material in which the writer, who is a well-known person, refers to a certain code, and says, "I am sure it will protect the boys' amateur standing and their morale."

I need to say these attitudes to me lie in the failure to recognize that the term "amateurism" is an abstraction and like many abstractions that perform useful and vital functions in our life, it has no fixed meaning in a philological sense. Its meaning varies from time to time and from place to place. It is like some of the key phrases in the Constitution of the United States. As the late Chief Justice Hughes put it at one time, "The Constitution means what the judges say it means."

Amateurism means what people say it means and, in our situation, what the NCAA says it means for its purposes. Certainly, the history of the word bears this out. It is derived from the Latin "amator" being one who has a taste for anything. It came into use in the latter part of the seventeenth century press as a connoisseur of fine arts. The first record of its use in print was in 1784, and it also referred to one who appreciated the arts of painting and music.

The earliest connotation our organization was able to find was in the

sports context concerning prize fighting, but the term was used to describe the spectator. The amateurs were the spectators.

In the first half of the nineteenth century professionalism didn't enter into consideration at all. In 1831, for example, teams of Oxford and Leander competed and each team got 200 pounds, about \$1000. Both were considered amateurs.

A gentleman could be an amateur because he could afford to follow the rules in sports other than rugby. Actually this continued in rugby until 1871. There is a record of being turned down on the ground that it included people who were mechanics and artisans, not that it included people who played for money.

In sports other than rugby, by 1880 the class distinction had been relaxed, such as in cricket, and those who were not gentlemen were allowed to participate. Their influx was followed by disorders, gambling, bribery, impersonation, or some such thing. So the amateurs sought to fight against these developments by setting up a strict code, and one of the principal elements of that code was that a person could not use his skill for financial gain.

At the time that the NCAA started, therefore, the general notion of amateurism included the idea that the person could not use his athletic skill for gain or be paid for participation. The NCAA was free to set up whatever definition it wanted. So were other sports organizations. The NCAA has done so. Other athletic organizations have done so. And the definitions are not fully consistent. There is no reason really for lamentation or for cynicism. The purposes of different organizations are different, and in the field of athletics this is true, even though they may all seek to bring themselves under the banners of the average.

How does the NCAA define amateurism? The definition is in the Constitution, Article 3, Section 1, and perhaps Section 4, and Official Interpretations 1 through 23 and 40 through 46. These total approximately 10 pages of rather fine print in the 1969 NCAA MANUAL.

It is not my intention to peruse these provisions here, but I am sure you are all familiar with them. Let me make just a few remarks about them to lay the foundation for the point of my discussion.

Many of these provisions have to do with paying, money, compensation, or their equivalents. Some do not. Some relate to associating or playing with professionals. Some relate to dealing with professionals or with representatives of professionals, as if one word or in the meaning of one word. Most of them relate to money, however.

This is not a blind following of English tradition. The colleges had that experience when intercollegiate athletics got started. There was no active amateur code and there was very little control. In the latter part of the nineteenth century, money played a large part; the hiring of franchises, the use of people who had no other relationship with the institution. They participated in the sports program and ultimately brought about the attention of the institution.

Furthermore, experience has shown that the presence of money has a bad influence. It can have a bad influence. It affects the heart; that is to say, if a person treasures his money or money's worth or financial gain there is where the heart will be.

Why has the NCAA ruled it out? We are seeking to keep the intercollegiate athletic program in a state of balance and in proportion to

the main business of the institution which is the education of the student.

There is nothing inconsistent with a strong athletic program, but the main business of the institution for the athlete and the main business of the athlete in the institution is education. His treasure should be, and for the most part is, the treasure of the mind and of the spirit and that is where his heart is, and, of course, the treasures of the spirit and body are a substantial area of the participation in athletics. This is the structure that has been built. It has not been built because there is anything immoral about professional athletics or there is anything bad about money.

Indeed, to a certain extent, as long as it keeps in proportion and as long as it is related to a student's educational goals and the educational goals of the institution, we do strive and have strived for more than a decade now to afford him with adequate support to pursue his education, within limits of course, and to keep his attitude and his interest pointed in the direction that we think proper.

It has not always worked, of course, and I am sure all of us could give examples where people found that their treasure did not lie in that direction, but for the most part it has been a system that has kept the program in proper relationship to the educational goals. In the institutions with which I am familiar, it has commanded the support of the vast majority of educators who have no specific personal interest in the program, but see it in relationship to education.

It is very unlikely that anyone will say, "On a given day let's get rid of amateurism and turn to the pros." That isn't likely to happen, and I cannot predict that it will happen. But what is likely to happen is an erosion step by step, item by item.

One of the reasons the Council was particularly interested in this subject this year was developments with respect to other amateur organizations in which it was urged that their rules be used instead of NCAA rules, or NCAA rules be adjusted to theirs.

I have two or three examples here, and while I am not going to read them in detail, let me mention them.

The United States Soccer Football Association, which I believe properly to be an amateur organization, has several rules which are at variance with those of the NCAA. According to the USSFA, an amateur player may play on any team with a registered professional player or on a professional soccer team if he does not receive remuneration. Our interpretation, of course, requires that a person not participate on teams which are professional or which have professional affiliation or on which there are enrolled professionals. The Soccer Association provides for reinstating a person to his amateur status under such conditions. NCAA rules prohibit that.

Another is that he may coach and referee in any other sport, other than the sport of soccer; that is to say, the prohibition against income from refereeing or using his athletic knowledge is limited, and he may be a professional player in another sport as long as he is an amateur soccer player. NCAA rules prohibit that.

The United States Golf Association has some rules at variance with ours. For example, one of the awards permitted is a prize or testimonial of a retail value not to exceed \$200. The prize or testimonial rule is that it must not be of such nature as the equivalent of money,

but as a matter of practical construction, the rules usually are interpreted to allow such things as golf clubs, golf balls, golf bags and sweaters which may be converted into money. NCAA official interpretations prohibit that.

Rule 10 of the Golf Association permits amateurs to participate in the golf clubs without full payment of dues for the class of membership, or privilege awarded as an honorary recognition or recognition of an outstanding performance or contribution. The NCAA Constitution prohibits any fees arrangement for athletes as such.

The Golf Association provides for reinstatement of an amateur after he has once been a professional.

The Lawn Tennis Association has a number of rules which are at variance with those of the NCAA. One of the first ones permits an amateur to participate in an approved tournament or exhibition with the professional even when the professional is competing for a cash award.

In golf, this is one of the questions raised with the Council: Can a coach and his student play as a twosome when the coach is competing for a prize, with the understanding, of course, that the student will receive no award? The Council ruled he could not. Tennis has a somewhat similar arrangement.

The tennis amateur may permit his name to be used in connection with advertising for sporting goods of a manufacturer, wholesaler or otherwise, provided he does not accept money. NCAA rules prohibit the endorsement of commercial products, using pictures or personal tributes.

The Tennis Association permits an amateur to act as a consultant to a manufacturer provided such service does not violate any other legislation. Our organization of course prohibits that.

The Amateur Hockey Association has been given permission to use nine professionals in the 1970 World Championships to be held in Canada.

Even in the Olympics—that is to say the International Olympic Committee—there is a movement under way on the part of a vast number of Communist Bloc countries to let the whole concept of amateur athletes go and replace it with the concept of Olympic athletes. The Olympic athlete would be defined as a person who followed certain principles in engaging in fair competition and had certain ethical ideals, but who could be supported entirely for his Olympic purposes.

The message I would like to leave is that we ought to resist these encroachments upon the amateur rules. We ought not to allow our rules and concepts to be whittled away. This should be true even though the organization which has a rule which is more flexible than ours is recognized as an honest and a tight organization, because our rules have been designed for a certain purpose and we should, in defining amateurism, always have in mind not some vague ideals or some principle which has basic moral overtones, but the basic idea that the principal purpose of the athlete is to get an education. Whatever we can do for him to further that purpose we should do, but if we open up the gates to the point where he becomes or is tempted to become interested and absorbed in treasures other than those that are found

in the institutions making up our membership, that is where his heart will be, and the program ultimately and our legislation and individual institutions will suffer. [Applause]

Jesse T. Haddock (Wake Forest University): Mr. Plant attempted to show what several organizations have done with amateurs. How can the NCAA rationalize its position on the two topics we have discussed? How can we be concerned about whether or not a student plays with a professional and yet give him a payment or grant-in-aid, when obviously he has little chance of performing major objectives in the institution to which he goes? In other words, we are concerned with the educational advancement of the youngster. How can we rationalize giving him a grant-in-aid with a grade point average at which he cannot graduate?

Mr. Plant: This, of course, has been the subject of the managements of professionals in some ways. The 1.600 legislation was drafted after a lot of arguments. It has been the experience in the Big Ten Conference, with which I am associated that the number of people who graduate is tremendously higher than it used to be without that limitation.

Now, some of my faculty colleagues look down their noses a little at 1.600, but it will ultimately reach a higher level, we hope. This is a start. The point is, he is given a grant-in-aid because the figures seem to show to the committee that he has a reasonable chance. I think we find he has a chance, and that educational possibility is enough. It could be better, but at least it is a lot better now than it was some time in the past.

Lysle Butler (Oberlin College): The Constitution already has started the erosion that you referred to. It says an athlete should not receive pay for any athletic performance. Is the NCAA, through its Long Range Planning Committee or some other body eliminating this type of erosion? We have been concerned about the erosion of the rules to which you refer. Is there an attempt being made in the near future to have perhaps a need factor rather than an athletic grant-in-aid?

Mr. Plant: I am not qualified to answer that. I know there has been some discussion of this subject in the Council, and I understood this morning a committee has been appointed to study the feasibility of a need factor on a national scale.

Chairman Flynn: There is a new committee just formed to study whether or not we should have a national need factor.

Recruiting—Changes To Be Made

The last panel, which is the most controversial I am sure, has to do with recruiting and the changes that have been suggested in our legislation.

To discuss this subject we have Alan Chapman, faculty representative of Rice University, Vice-President of District 6 and a member of the NCAA Council; Mr. Robert James, commissioner of the Mid-American Conference; Edwin Cady, faculty athletic representative at Indiana University and chairman of the NCAA Special Committee on Recruiting; Ben Schwartzwalder of Syracuse University, a former president of the American Football Coaches Association and substituting for Paul Dietzel, its current president; and Cliff Fagan, executive secretary of the National Federation of State High School Athletic

Associations.

Robert C. James (Mid-American Conference): It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Association's Special Committee on Recruiting, along with John Bateman, head football coach, Rutgers University; John Dromo, head basketball coach, University of Louisville; Howard Gentry, director of athletics, Tennessee State University; Jim Owens, head football coach, University of Washington, and our most capable chairman, Professor Edwin Cady, faculty representative, Indiana University.

Seldom, if ever, have I seen a group of men embark upon a most difficult assignment with more seriousness of purpose. Each recognized that we were undertaking a study of major importance to intercollegiate athletics. We felt responsive to items of major national concern to colleges and high schools, to suggestions from the NCAA, plus a host of news articles on the evils of recruiting. Additionally, each member called upon his own experiences and those advanced by his colleagues. Of initial import, and rightfully so, were the concerns expressed by the high schools through their capable executive secretary, Cliff Fagan.

Specifically, they are: (1) Soliciting a prospective student-athlete at the site of competition in which he is a participant; (2) Placing a limit on the number of visitations to a given prospect; (3) Soliciting prospective student-athletes during a high school sports season.

Principal concerns expressed by the committee members related to establishing control of on-campus visitation and entertainment, recruitment in home, home locality and school environs and entertainment of family and relatives, on the basis that: (1) The justification of expense-paid visitation is to acquaint the prospective student-athlete with the facilities, patterns of life and atmosphere normal to student life on that campus and its environs; (2) Two expense-paid visits to the campus are sufficient for the purpose described above; and (3) On-campus entertainment of parents or guardian should be restricted to two persons and one visit.

The committee feels the recommendations sponsored by the Council to be considered at this Convention most certainly will eliminate many abuses currently in existence. The committee further deemed it necessary to determine the feelings of the Association as to whether or not our thoughts are in accord prior to continuance. If we are, in fact, barking up the wrong tree, then a new cast should be appointed.

We sincerely believe that much additional thought must be given to this important area and stand willing to review and make recommendations. The committee looked with favor upon legislation which would restrict the number of institutions which a prospective student-athlete may visit, but has not perfected an administrative plan to control this most vital area. There is no question that the complexities of writing an equitable rule to limit the number of paid visits are substantial. We do not believe, however, that the idea should be set aside without further exploration. Mr. Cady will discuss in greater detail this and other considerations by the committee and the possibility of future legislation to correct them.

It is my personal opinion that we have exhausted the luxury of sitting back and expecting others to perfect legislation overcoming the evils connected with recruiting and curtailing some of the costly

practices involved. It is not too difficult to define that which is excessive and detrimental to our programs. Let us devote an equivalent amount of time in constructive efforts to bring recruiting budgets back to reality as we do in looking for loopholes and seeking to gain advantage over each other.

Simply stated, let's say what we do and do what we say! [Applause]

Chairman Flynn: There are special problems concerned with the high schools in regard to recruiting by colleges and universities, and it is my pleasure and privilege to introduce a great friend of intercollegiate athletics, the executive secretary of the National High School Federations, Mr. Clifford Fagan. [Applause]

Clifford Fagan (National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations): The high schools of the country, as you all know, have long recognized that recruiting by colleges for athletic purposes as well as many other purposes, including academic, arts, sciences and so on, is necessary. We believe that for the most part this is as presently arranged a good program. We look toward the possibility of improving it.

Professor Cady has said that recruiting has always been with us. We anticipate it always will be. We think, however, that it has become increasingly complicated and perhaps as presently constructed has some abuses which we trust can be eliminated through a cooperative effort. It is complicated in part because there are so many agencies and people involved: the colleges and universities themselves, the high schools, the boy, the parents and the game with which we are concerned, whichever it might be. In addition, we have the alumni, the community from which the boy comes and the community in which the institution is located.

I say to you most sincerely that the high schools are interested in the best possible interscholastic and intercollegiate programs of athletics. We are not interested in these programs for today only, but are interested in them for years to come. We believe whatever we do should be done with the future as one of the considerations.

Certainly there will be times when you do not agree with what we do in our attempt to have the best program, but we think that thus far we have a reasonably good record as far as encouraging an increasing number to participate in educationally sound athletics. We intend to continue this common interest with you.

Your programs motivate ours. We are looking forward to more motivation. There are some signs, gentlemen, that we need increasing motivation, and there are some pockets in which there is less interest in interscholastic athletics today than there has been in the immediate years past. We at the high school level want more participation and better participation.

I think you will not consider it unkind if I refer to some of the processes in recruiting as needing correction. We do believe there are some things which develop that are not in the best interests of the game. Certainly many of these have been corrected through your efforts. It was at least six years ago that your representatives worked with some of the high school people in the structuring of a code of ethical conduct. This has been helpful and we hope at this meeting you will take steps to further improve the situation.

The first category in which we believe there is some need for im-

provement is the waste of both time and money. We believe that for the most part the boys know pretty well at the beginning of their senior year the two or three schools which they are principally interested in attending and in participating in intercollegiate athletics. They can tell you at that time which schools they look to with favor, and we think most of them if they had but a single choice could make it early in their senior year. Therefore, we feel it is reasonable on your part to restrict or limit the number of expense-paid trips a prospect may have to a given campus, the number of times an athletic staff member may visit this prospect's home, the number of times and kinds of entertainment you might provide for a prospect and the number of times that you might assist his parents in a visitation to a campus.

Certainly those of you who are most directly involved in recruiting recognize that some boys exploit the situation. In the community from which I come, three years ago there were four boys who appealed to many college and university departments. They had a little game going for themselves in which they compared the number of miles each could log, to see who could have the greatest number of miles and who could visit the greatest number of campuses. This is not in the best interest of the boy and certainly it is a waste of time and money.

There is a second area in which improvement is necessary because some of the recruiting affects a boy in an undesirable way. If he is contacted at the site of competition, or even at home immediately prior to a game or during the track meet it certainly takes the boy's mind off the job which is immediately before him. We ask your serious consideration, and we hope you will look on it with favor, of the possibility of limiting contact with the boy to times other than at the site of the competition and when he is preparing to compete.

Too vigorously recruiting two or three members of the team or perhaps one member of the team, if the recruiting is done consistently, affects the team because it may cause jealousies among teammates. I am not certain this can always be avoided, but when the representative of a college comes back time after time and talks to only one boy or evidences interest in only one boy, it frequently has an undesirable effect on the rest of the team. This is undesirable for the school and eventually even for the community.

We recognize that many of your problems are due to the fact that there are high school coaches who solicit your interest in their boys and sometimes give glowing reports about an ability the boy does not have. We acknowledge this adds to your problems, and we hope you will discourage the coaches from doing this. We trust we will have an opportunity to join you in trying to get the coaches to be more reliable and to let you conduct this aspect of your own program.

Therefore, we trust the membership of the NCAA will provide some protection for the school and the boy, by not contacting him at the site of competition.

We trust there will be a limitation of the number of paid trips the boy can make to a campus, that you won't bother him too much or too often at his home, and that who may accompany the boy on trips to the campus will be spelled out.

It would be constructive if eventually the boy is not contacted dur-

ing his sports season. Right now this may be an impossibility, but it is desirable.

Perhaps in the not too distant future you will establish respect for a commitment a prospect has made and after he indicates to you he has selected his college, that he no longer will receive invitations from other colleges. Perhaps sometime in the future we can limit recruiting to boys during the last two semesters in high school.

We believe it would be possible for the high schools to provide some kind of legislation in this matter. We are sure that the High School Association could do this. If this were done, your membership would not have the conditions under which they can work best and which you really want. I fear action on our part would be too limiting and would not be to your advantage.

In addition, there probably would be too many rules. Each state association would have its separate rules, and this would make it extremely difficult for you people to work.

So we are looking forward to your making more progress, to keep on the job, to regulate recruiting to the benefit both of our program and your program.

I want to thank the NCAA for the consideration it has given the high school programs down through the years. We are greatly appreciative. We hope we are able to help you with your program. [Applause]

Chairman Flynn: Our next speaker is a member of the NCAA Council. He will explain the legislation on recruiting that will be brought up for voting in our business session on Wednesday.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): All I can add at this point is that the Council endorses fully the feelings both of Mr. James on the part of the Special Recruiting Committee and Mr. Fagan on behalf of the high schools. The recruiting activities have reached the point where some action must be taken from the point of view not only of the money involved and the harassment of the high school students, but also from the bad public image intercollegiate athletics is deriving from our over-all attitude toward recruiting.

For this reason the Council is proposing to you most of the recommendations submitted by the Recruiting Committee. These you will find embodied mainly in four amendments and three official interpretations.

Amendment No. 34 (page A-17) has to do with Article 6, Section 5, of the Bylaws and in essence limits the number of expense-paid visits the prospective student may have to the campus. There are variations on how to finance the visits in the sequence of the proposed legislation.

The two official interpretations are Nos. 9 and 10 (page A-25). Those particular pages deal with amendment No. 34. Interpretation No. 11 (page A-26) provides that when a prospect is visiting your campus and being entertained by you on one of the official paid visits, leaving out again the legalistic phrasing, the entertainment is at the level that a normal student would experience on your campus.

Bylaw Amendment No. 35 (page A-17) deals with the entertainment of friends and relatives. The new O.I. 154 also adds that all of the above is accumulative to the student whether he is in high school, prep school or junior college.

Last are Amendments No. 36 (page A-18) and No. 37 (page A-19). No. 36 in brief limits to two the number of visits at the site of the prospect's hometown by the coach or representative of an athletic staff, exclusive of those who reside in the hometown. No. 37 prohibits contacting the student-athlete at the site of a contest in which he is a participant.

Gentlemen, I recommend all of these amendments and interpretations for your consideration.

At every convention we have some legislation which one considers crucial, and I think this is what you may call the crucial legislation of this Convention. Admittedly there may be imperfections in what we propose and other propositions will come forth later. We have reached the time to stop sitting on our hands and complaining about the situation. One of the great attributes of this organization is that we can come back year after year and by proposing additional amendments to patch up the inadequacies we may find. Although some of you may have reservations about one item or another, I urge that you give serious consideration to adopting these proposals and move forward into a period of solidarity. [Applause]

Chairman Flynn: We are very fortunate to have a successful football coach to represent the American Football Coaches Association and to tell their side of the recruiting problem: Mr. Ben Schwartzwalder.

Ben Schwartzwalder (Syracuse University): Paul Dietzel was desperate and I was the only one he could find. Paul said something about coaching being hard and based on winning and losing, and it had something to do with recruiting guides. You folks are the ones who hire coaches, so you know all about that.

From one who knows a little of this and not very well, I think you are certainly on the right track. And who am I to question it? You are the folks who are telling us. But this is what you should do—get it spelled out about visits and how many representatives you may meet. I see Woody Hayes' phone bill was \$27,000. Let's cut Woody down a little bit. [Laughter] They can't all be local calls.

Let's get some rules from the coach's point of view spelled out so we know how many visits are allowed as long as it is uniform. We can't have more than one trip at Syracuse. Our budget is so small we cannot afford a second trip. We try to restrict it to boys who have applied for entrance. That is something for you gentlemen who are interested in cutting down expenses.

This will be a big step forward, solidifying something that needs to be done. [Applause]

Chairman Flynn: Our last panelist, the chairman of the Committee on Recruiting, will among other things outline future legislation that his committee is working on. [Applause]

Edwin H. Cady (Indiana University): No reasonably informed observer can doubt that the problems concerning the recruitment of student-athletes are acute. They will remain so quite as far as one can see into the future, regardless of the fate of the current Special Committee and its proposals. If not this committee, then some other will have to confront the recruiting problems.

It might be helpful to mention the general principles on which we have been working. To us there have been four basic and general concerns: (1) The personal and academic welfare of the pre-college

athlete who becomes a prospective student-athlete; (2) The defensibility, on sound principles of value, of our recruitment practices; (3) Expenses; and (4) The good name and the proper public understanding of collegiate athletics.

Like high school associations severally and nationally, the committee sets great store by the prohibition of formal, institutional recruitment of a prospect before he has completed his junior year in high school. We hope the Council will again bring such a rule to you next year.

On the question of limiting to some sane number the expense-paid visits to institutions by any one prospective student-athlete, your committee has found itself stumped (perhaps unnecessarily) and asks for your help. Almost everybody we hear from thinks such a limitation essential and seems to think five is a sensible number of visits. The problem is to write a rule which would not give rise to abuses perhaps worse than the problem we wish to solve, and a rule which would be workable in the present climates of opinion and sentiment.

Might a simple rule compound certain recruiting evils by a regressive effort? That is, might we give rise to a recruiter's effort to preempt the visitation opportunities of many more potential prospects than the preemptor has any intention of actually forwarding into paid visits? Many of the pressures now exerted to get a prospect to visit might be to get him to put Siwash on his "visit list"—and perhaps keep Splitlip Teachers off—even if Siwash were pushing for 300 commitments while intending only 100 actual invitations. It looks hard (to us) to write the right rule.

It has also occurred to us to worry about both institutional and legal vulnerability to a single rule. Imagine for a moment another Lew Alcindor, this time from Chicago. Suppose he has five slots on his visit list and puts down five midwestern institutions—one Big Ten, one Big Eight, one Mid-American, one Missouri Valley and one independent. Then, fully committed, he is somehow struck by the dream of UCLA or Texas or one of the Carolinas. Can we in fact debar him from visiting, or matriculating, or competing at one of these fine educational institutions? Might we not be in grave danger of several kinds of legal action on behalf of the prospective student-athlete? Maybe the committee shies from shadows, perhaps we have confused ourselves. We would be grateful for your help and guidance on this point.

We are concerned about the existence and activities in some places of the paid staff member who does not coach but works full-time as "The Recruiter." Perhaps he should disappear. Almost certainly he should stay away during the basketball season from the football prospect who is playing basketball.

Should we simply prohibit the recruiting coach or staff member (or even the non-employed representative of an institution's athletic interests) from spending any money in the off-campus entertainment of a prospective student-athlete?

Might we define the acceptable "representative of athletic interests" as only one who resides in the home community or communities contiguous thereto?

Should we try to make the Interconference Letter of Intent truly national? Or make its effective date earlier?

Should acceptance of an institutional letter of commitment or tender of grant-in-aid become equivalent to signing the Interconference Letter?

Should press announcements of a prospect's "commitment" to an institution prior to the date for signing of letters and should press conferences and/or pictures of "signing" be prohibited?

Should there be a period of "silence" or "no-contact" between a prospect and the institution during the time between the issuance of a letter of intent and its return or expiration?

Should there be limitations on contacts via long-distance telephone?

What can we do about the "fair labeling" of grants-in-aid? Should there be a NCAA model form?

Should we try to initiate positive campaigns for parent, school, media and public education about the truths and realities of life, the future, the value situation, the prospects of the student-athlete, his recruitment and his problems of choice? Are we sufficiently effective, or are we passive, in guiding and enlightening the vast public enthusiasm for collegiate sport in the United States? [Applause]

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis): I would like to commend the committee and the Council on the presentation. There is one aspect of the presentation I find a little difficult. This pertains to the entertainment of the student on the campus. When you consider the situation in a metropolitan area like Minneapolis where we have two campuses, five miles apart and most of our student body are commuters. The student entertainment is not in the immediate environment of the classroom or the dormitory but in the metropolitan area. I find it very difficult to support the rationale of limiting the entertainment of the prospective student to that area defined as the campus.

Furthermore, in this context I believe it would not be possible for a parent or an individual to invite the prospective student from the suburbs and entertain him.

Mr. Cady: There are questions that worry the communities a good deal. I guess the right way to say this is that we thought finally not in terms of black and white; we tried to think in terms of scale and quality. As long as you start talking about scale and quality obviously you give yourselves problems of enforcement. A good many of the problems involved are essentially financial problems, and we hoped that we could provide directives in particular on something which would warrant keeping the scale and the quality of entertainment down to what is reasonable and representative of actual student life on that campus.

I can give you some examples of this. One of the committee members, a very useful one, is a man who never gets to NCAA meetings because he is a basketball coach, and as a "frinstance" he said, "Can I take a basketball prospect to the Kentucky Derby?" On the whole, we thought, "Yes, you can." It appears normal and reasonable to expect that a student in Louisville should be able to betake himself to the Derby, which is a local event.

I was asked if John Pont at Indiana University could take a football prospect to the Indianapolis Automobile Races. The answer is, "No." It is not local. It is not really part of the community or campus scene. Bloomington is not that kind of place. In Bloomington, we have certain advantages that the metropolitan campus might not have. We have

certain disadvantages. The point is to keep your entertainment at a scale and a level of quality which really represents the kind of people who live on that campus, among other things, so as not to deceive the student as to the quality of experiences which are going to be his when he gets to your campus. There has been a good deal of complaint about that in recent years, some of it focused on very special problems of recruitment.

Robley C. Williams (University of California, Berkeley): I understand our rules with respect to recruiting are matters within reasonable bounds, but also there is an aspect to present certain advantages in some institutions for potential students. I suppose it has been considered, but I would like to have it discussed. The limitation on paid visits to some small number obviously gives an enormous recruiting advantage to those institutions in large metropolitan communities. If a prospect lives five and a half miles from the campus and the campus is not going to pay his way, but it is already favorable for the metropolitan institution while the rule would have some serious consequences for others, because of entertainment available.

Mr. James: Our feeling is that the purpose of the campus visit is for the young man to see the educational opportunities available upon that campus and what that campus has to offer him which would make the institution a factor as well as the athletic program. Granted there will always be a discrepancy in the entertainment opportunities available to an individual in a given area, still we felt compelled to make recommendations that would afford the young man the opportunity to go through that school. The complaints we received were so many where the young men were visiting campuses and had never even seen the school.

William L. Lakie (University of California, Davis): In the light of statements made regarding recruitment of high school students, in the light of the need for early application, many of our coaches are in contact with the applicants through the year. For example, if a student makes application by October 1 for the following year the coach has taken advantage in contact.

Mr. Cady: I haven't any doubt that the kind of thing you are saying is true for some institutions. It is not always true for others. It does mean, of course, that the coaches had the summer in which to do recruiting. This is really true.

Also it must be true there is not necessarily a match-up between applications and athletic recruitment. It has to be true that a good many athletes are making multiple applications. I am sure that kind of thing makes the registrars scream, but I am sure it is also a fact.

I would like to point out that all we have is a considerable feeling of the desirability of this kind of rule, and we do not presently propose the rule as such.

[The session then adjourned.]

COLLEGE DIVISION ROUND TABLE

Tuesday Morning, January 13, 1970

The session was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by the Chairman, Lewis Comer, California State College, Hayward.

Chairman Comer: Gentlemen, welcome to the College Division Round Table. Our topic today is the control of the rising costs of intercollegiate athletics while maintaining our programs at the present level.

[Chairman Comer then introduced the members of the panel.]

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): The rising cost of intercollegiate athletics constitutes a major issue before this Convention. It seems each year something comes to the fore as a hot topic, such as freshman eligibility or the 1,600 rule. Yesterday Sam Barnes mentioned that the rising costs offer the greatest threat to intercollegiate athletics.

I recall an oldtimer telling about a comment by Bob Dugby. In substance, he said very few football coaches survive two losing seasons and very few athletic directors survive two losing football coaches. Possibly in this day and age we might say very few athletic directors survive two deficit budget years. It may be a little strong, but we have a responsibility and sometimes we try to duck it when it is there.

I recall the first NCAA Convention I attended, and Jim Corbett of LSU talked about their program, which is entirely different from ours. LSU at that time attempted to carry at least a million dollar surplus in the football budget. He talked about his interview for the job. He went over everything with the interviewing board and finally Jim asked them, "I understand the thing quite well, I believe, but what happens if we go into the red?"

Mr. Corbett said, "I looked down on the longest forefinger I ever saw in my life, and the banker pointed to me and said, 'Young man, that's your responsibility.'"

At this time the situations are not quite that severe in the College Division. I know some of you operate in the general budget and you say, "This kind of comparison is ridiculous in my situation; we are an educational institution and don't operate that way." If you do operate out of the general budget it is still your responsibility, and I suspect your president views it that way. Your problems may not be quite that severe, but they are similar.

One of my superiors has referred to athletics on our campus as a hungry monster. I would have to agree that he is correct. I am always seeking funds and ways to finance new programs and keep those we have going. He meant it in a nice way, I am certain, but he is right. We have an insatiable appetite for money and must have it to operate.

I get the idea, however, that the rising cost situation is severe to the point that if we do not come up with answers and conclusions something will happen, and we may not like the result.

The NCAA cost survey is a step in the right direction. If you have

filled it out you know it is extremely time-consuming and difficult to complete. I spent three weekends and a couple of evenings myself, and wound up estimating a great portion of it.

Probably the first thing that struck all of us as we filled out the questionnaire was the fact that costs have gone up more than we had realized. As we compared the figures year-by-year and then five years and ten years ago as suggested, we realized that costs had gone up even more than we anticipated.

Let's look for a moment into the "why" of this. Why have costs come up? Certainly we can blame much of it on inflation. I had a cup of coffee at dinner last evening and had in mind what the cost of coffee has done over the past few years.

In capital improvements, when we attempted to develop a physical education center at South Dakota State, we worked on it four years. We could have built four years ago a fine structure that would have cost roughly three million dollars, but the same building today would cost at least four million. We have lost a million dollars in four years on our project. I have been told that is a reasonably conservative evaluation.

Second, of course, is travel, food and lodging. In travel we have "first class," improving our mode of travel as well as going farther.

Equipment — and that will be discussed later — costs much more, especially because of the specialty aspect in our equipment purchase. There is one point in the area of insurance; we are assuming a greater responsibility than we have in the past because of the feeling of a moral responsibility, because of legal concern and what is right for the student-athlete.

Salaries have gone up, but probably not enough. Someone said the other day the American teacher was better off in 1939; the increases since then, which have been great, have really not kept up with inflation. I don't know whether that is correct, but if you are trying to hold a staff together it is an increased cost item, except in case of your own salary.

Sometimes the administration puts us in the position of feeling that our department is the only one that has had an increase, puts us on the defensive a little bit, and possibly they do that in the English or other departments, but it is logical with a 12 per cent inflation over a given period of time the cost of the athletic program will go up at least that much and you occasionally have to make that case with the administration.

Another factor in increased cost has been the addition of other sports. For years many of the College Division institutions operated a small program of really three sports, at least in the Midwest; football, basketball, track and field, and a little golf and tennis possibly, with the history professor teaching golf and that sort of thing. We had a small program with a two or three man staff. Now we have added, of course, baseball wrestling, cross country, gymnastics, ice hockey, soccer and volleyball. We have added to our staff.

We have increased responsibility for providing competition for women.

We have assumed greater responsibility in intramurals and we have improved the intramural program, doubling and tripling the expenditure in many cases. The advent of sports clubs is becoming intramural.

Many of us are finding responsibility reluctantly or by design in this kind of program. Some of us find responsibility for campus recreation. Some of us have assumed responsibility in new areas, such as the cheerleading squads and travel for the bands.

Some of us have joined a conference or been members of the conference where we have added supervisory officials or a full-time commissioner with an office and other very necessary items, but again a cost item.

Some of us have had other things shifted into our budget, whereby we have had to assume a greater responsibility in the area of salaries or equipment purchase or capital improvements.

I would hasten to add, in fairness to the administrators across the country, the reverse has been true also on many campuses, as programs have been added the administration has picked up part of the salary aspect or the responsibility for equipment or some of the staff travel.

Another item that has contributed tremendously to the recruitment cost is the expansion. There is no question about it. In the first place, the geographical expansion has been tremendous with more and more institutions seemingly feeling that they have to recruit practically from coast to coast or at least from a much broader geographical area than previously. It seems to me there must be some state in the country where the student-athletes are good enough to win with. You know, it cannot be that all of us live where we have to go some place else to get people we can win with.

It is a little ridiculous to go around the country and look at the newspapers in different cities to see coaches are saying, "We can't live with Blank State people; we have to get out." At the same time the coaches from another area come into that area to get athletes. I doubt it can be valid, but it is a fact of life.

Certainly travel for recruitment has changed with full expenses allowed and first class travel. The campus visitations and the costs involved, especially when mother and father come along, and it seems as though no good student-athlete exists any more who doesn't have a friend who is not a good athlete but a fine lad who comes along. The telephone costs which were cited yesterday totaled \$27,000. If we move the decimal point around we come up with yours.

Then consider the increased cost of the grant-in-aid program. Some may say, "That is not my concern. We don't have them as such." Then you are not concerned with this one, true, but many of us are.

In 1939 at South Dakota State, our grants-in-aid program, which is largely a work program, cost approximately \$10,000. In 1969, in the fall season our grant-in-aid program approximated \$100,000. We are still in the same conference, competing at the same level, with about the same results.

It appears that the winner in this particular case is the student-athlete. In other words, we are now granting assistance to lads who came because of educational opportunities and other reasons twenty years ago, and now we are extending aid to them.

Of course, many coaches operate on the theory that they must have full scholarships in order to recruit successfully, especially in football and basketball, and more so with a good, top prospect for track or wrestling in our area. Many, of course, will stand on the position that

they must have the same number of grants as their competition, and if at all possible more.

The next area of increased cost is two-platoon football. I don't believe there is any question that it has cost more. At the time of debating and voting, pros and cons were advanced relative to cost, but in our conference there is no question that two-platoon football has cost more than single-platoon football.

Certainly that is true in the case of staffing. In the old days, we had the head coach and line coach. We have today the defensive and the offensive specialists, which is a must if you are going to play in our conference. You have to have it to stay even with the other people.

Possibly the size of the traveling squad has increased some, although we do control that. Possibly more grants are needed and vital improvement responsibility is increased.

Another thing is the business of going "first class" as I mentioned in the upgrading of little areas. I will cite one example. In our place we have two fine student-athletes, track men, good students, both on a nice grant, not quite full grants but good grants in track and field, both pole vault over 10 feet, which is good in our area. I have watched them with a \$70 pole that seems to break three or four times a year, going down the runway and smashing an indoor box that cost me \$200, vaulting over a set of standards at \$485, knocking off a \$20 crossbar and landing in a \$1200 bed.

I realize things have changed from the days of the sawdust pit and aluminum pole. So not only do we have the pole vaulters but the pole vault activity's cost is greater than our total track program cost twelve or thirteen years ago.

The second thing that struck me as I filled out my cost survey questionnaire was that income has increased in my situation, but not in anywhere near the same degree as cost. The cost has gone up markedly and the income only slightly.

I ask myself: Why? Are we not winning? Yes, we are winning in about the same ratio as we were twenty years ago. Have we done a poor job of promotion? Possibly, but we are working harder at it and doing more things.

What are the reasons?

First, we have been reluctant to raise our admission fees. For example, we say, "We have had a bad year, we cannot raise it." So we keep it as it is. Then we have a championship team and raise it, but not in keeping with the rising costs.

We have been reluctant to go to our students, as I must go, with a vote to get the feeling of the students for some of the same reasons; the season wasn't good or we had little problems, or we have a tuition increase so they have not picked up the same portion of the load as they carried twenty years ago.

Now for people operating on the general institutional budget I suspect there is a reluctance to go in there with a hard-fisted case for increasing at the same rate as our costs have increased. If your institution is running a deficit, and many private institutions are, you couldn't get it no matter what kind of case you made. The point is income has slipped back.

Another factor is the professional sports influence. You might say, "Where you are, in South Dakota, that is not a factor." I think it is.

Maybe I have a case of paranoia in this, I don't know, but I am 260 miles from the Minnesota Vikings and the Minnesota Twins. When I go downtown on Monday morning for coffee with my self-appointed board of directors, a group of business men who have coffee daily in a certain place, I notice the conversation is different from ten years ago, and I am certain from twenty years ago. This past Monday morning I am certain much of the conversation was about the Minnesota Vikings-Kansas City Chiefs game, and about the Twins earlier, where ten years ago it was devoted to the South Dakota State University athletics.

Where the interest is the money and the people will follow, and I do believe that the pros have made it difficult for all of us, not just the persons in the city where you have professional teams.

We have been guilty of poor promotion. We have sat on our programs and said we have a good program and people support it, and have gone the same way year after year—if the public wants it they will come and get it. Our stadiums have become overgrown in many cases and our approaches to the whole idea of intercollegiate athletics have become archaic. You may say this is not in the educational field; I did not get into the educational field or intercollegiate athletics to become a P. T. Barnum; I am not a promoter or business man; if I had wanted that I would have opened my own shop.

That is fine and possibly some of you can afford to stand on that. I cannot. I must come up with ways to further finance my program. Sometimes this attitude of "I was not hired to do promotional work" is really an excuse to avoid something that is difficult. Promotion is time-consuming and takes a lot of thought and effort. It is hard work. Many times we have ducked it under the guise of its being noneducational.

All of us need to learn more about business techniques and budgeting practice. I participated in a survey as many of you did. A total of 583 athletic directors replied. One of the questions relative to the athletic director asked this question: "In what areas of professional competency do you consider yourself most deficient upon your appointment as director of athletics?" The area checked most, 142 times, was legal knowledge; second, insurance; third, fund raising, fourth, finance and accounting.

Here are four areas in business administration, if you like, that apparently people in our profession feel they are deficient in.

Some institutions have awakened to the problem. Ohio University has a program in athletic administration. I am a physical educator by background. I have my doctorate from Springfield, a pretty fair physical education school, and I said this to the National Education people in Boston: If the physical educators believe athletics is a part of physical education and want to see it continued that way then the profession has to do a better job of preparing people to administer intercollegiate athletics as over against the physical education side, the recreation side, the health side, and in the business administration areas where we are weak. I throw that challenge to you who are physical educators and have anything to say about a graduate program. If we don't do a better job in this area someone else will take it over to the detriment of the whole program.

Second, we need to consider limitations through legislation. In our conference we limit the travel squad to 38 in football and to 21 in basketball, for many reasons, but mostly financial reasons.

Control of the number of visits is necessary.

Consider limitations on grants-in-aid. Once again in our conference, primarily for financial reasons, we limit football grants to 40 and basketball grants to 10. That is the total of the program. We define our grants as room, board, tuition and fees, no \$10 a month for expenses and no books. All of those measures were taken to hold down our costs.

The 1,600 rule has helped some of us to reduce cost by eliminating errors on the marginal students. I am very proud of my basketball coach. He is a fine coach and has been with us five years. Everyone he has approved has started at some time. He is very efficient at it, and it is helpful. I think freshman eligibility eventually centered around finance.

We have a simpler conference letter of intent, and that has helped to reduce cost in the summertime for a third visit. These types of legislation are necessary and we must explore all possibilities in that area.

The third thing we do is curtail procurement and priorities.

You are probably aware the Big Ten Conference voted for divisional play in one sport.

We can drop an activity. In our case I never will be a part to dropping anything that is good for our program and good for our students, as long as I can finance it. I may be spread a little too thin as a result.

The idea of a closed conference, such as the Midwest Conference, where you have chartering of 10 institutions and control things from the academic point of view as well as from the financial point of view is a possible solution.

You know, the athletic directors have to represent the staff and their needs to the president and represent the president to the staff. I have tried to maintain the position of trying to be a staff man. I try to tell the same story in both camps, making the staff's needs known to the president and making the president's needs known to the staff.

For example, one western state recently enacted legislation on grant-in-aid waivers—you probably saw the publicity—to the tune of over a quarter of a million dollars annually for scholarships on the state basis. This could be one of the greatest boons to athletics or it could be the end. One of the papers said at the same time the legislature refused to approve additional funds for ghetto areas of certain cities in the United States. If it were matched up against that kind of priority this may not be the right route to go.

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: As the chairman of the NCAA Insurance Committee, I have been asked to discuss the increased cost of insurance. Very bluntly, insurance today is more expensive. Everything goes up, so it is no different than anything else. It goes along with the general economy.

We have two kinds of NCAA insurance—travel and athletic injury. We have been very fortunate with the travel insurance. I don't know how many of you realize this, but the cost today is less for travel insurance than when the program was started some years ago. This has been to date a very good experience financially for the insurance company and the colleges. I hope the good Lord keeps it that way. In my opinion it is probably the best insurance buy in the travel field or in any field for that matter for college athletic departments.

It is the only company since about 1955 that has lowered a rate, which

they did in 1968 and 1969. The original contract was renewed for a three-year period at a ten per cent cut in premium. However, during the first contract period there were no claims. Thank heavens, we went through those years without any serious accidents.

During the second contract we did have a large claim, as most of you remember, with the Lamar State College track team returning from a meet when several of them and the coach were killed in an airplane crash. The prompt action of the company after this accident in paying claims immediately, which of course did not help the grief any, did help in the expenses of the families. It was really a great relief for those of us who for years have promoted the idea of a contract for travel accident insurance.

When you get into athletic injuries, the other phase of our insurance program, it is a very different story. Premiums have risen from beginning costs. The first year it was \$1 per man across the country for every sport. It has risen from that cost in my own case in football to \$24.50 a man for \$250 deductible insurance plan.

Each new contract has resulted in a raise in premium, and even so there hasn't been a single carrier that has broken even on NCAA athletic injury contracts.

In any effort to remedy some of these problems, the committee over the years has made many changes in the basic structure of the plan. Originally the cost was the same for all sports across the board in all areas of the country, and everyone had to take the same deductible for all sports. Gradually over the years, in order to equalize the cost based on injury experience for sports, the plan was changed resulting in higher premiums for the sports that had the worst experience.

Sports were divided into groups based on this experience and there could be different deductibles for these groups. Football, hockey and others were in one group, soccer in another group; and in track and other sports that did not have the injury experience, the cost was different and you could take a different deductible. The whole plan was to try to equalize the cost and have premium payments take care of the sports where the injuries actually resulted.

Other studies show the difference in medical and hospital costs in various areas of the country. The plan then divided the country into areas based on these findings.

Thus we have reached the present plan, and I think it is about as equitable as you can possibly make it, considering the different medical costs in the West, the East and the Midwest.

No matter what happened, no matter what we did, no matter how much the premium was raised, the carriers—and we have had several—have never broken even, let alone made any money on the plan.

When Southwestern Life of Dallas, the last carrier before the present one, withdrew after many years, the Insurance Committee met with the Council to discuss the proposed plans and decided on Harvard Vancouver, with W. David Richman & Associates of Chicago. Mr. Richman in his proposal kept the floor plan as developed over the years, and the cost was a flat 75 per cent increase over the previous costs across the board. However, they agreed to sign a three-year contract on that plan so the cost would be the same over the next three years no matter what the inflationary situation in the country or anything else. They added 75 per cent across the board in one year, and that

was the best plan we could get. We had several companies propose plans, some of them in which the cost of the premium may not have been any more, may have been a little less, but they wanted one year's experience and they could adjust at the end of the year.

Everyone knows the medical and hospital costs have zoomed in recent years. We considered statistics on costs and taking the years 1957 and 1958 as a basis of 100 in that year, in 1968, ten years later, all consumer costs had gone up to 123.7. However, physician's fees had gone up to 149.1 and the hospital rates had gone up to 239.3 over the ten-year period.

This morning I turned on the television and there was a program involving six or seven doctors. Someone from the audience asked, "What is the cost of a room in your hospital, Doctor?" This is one of the Washington hospitals. He said, "A single room will cost you \$77 a day."

"What if I get in a room with someone else or a ward or something?"

He said, "You might lower it to \$58."

In view of those figures you can certainly see why insurance and insurance plans are zooming with the rest of the economy.

I quote these figures to show the problems besetting all of us including the insurance companies who have carried our plan and their efforts as well as ours to hold down the cost of the athletic insurance program for you as well as everyone else.

What can we do in this situation?

Well, first, this is a mutual task. Some people have sort of felt the insurance companies are up here somewhere, where they can dole out the money to take care of all accidents, no matter what the cost or anything. In this situation we are in a mutual where we pay premiums to the company and out of that costs are prorated back to us in premiums. If the company has to spend more money than it receives in premiums it has to raise its premiums. It behooves us to remember this and be honest in dealing with the carrier. After all, it is our money and it is a mutual affair.

We are fortunate in having David Richman, who is in Chicago and whom I can contact each day if necessary, handling the athletic injury insurance program. He has a deep interest in our whole athletic program. He has a deep interest in this particular part of the program because he was in the original group that proposed the program years ago and was responsible for it for four or five years.

Now, a bit of advice to all of us, and it may sound a little trite because you assume we all do it. Actually we don't, I along with the rest of you. There are four or five things that are pretty essential and of very basic nature.

One is to get your insurance application in on time. We have had schools starting football practice the next day and they have forgotten to get their application in.

The next thing is very important as far as cost and everything else is concerned. Read your policy carefully. Get all the facts. Look over the questions and the answers that they send you. Many of you have a tendency, myself included, to put it aside and when we have a problem we start looking for it.

Third, report any additions to the company immediately. We have talked about the additions to the program. Some have been adding

volleyball or water polo or maybe other activities and when you originally took out your insurance plan you had not figured on doing that. All of a sudden there is a demand for it and you put it in. Get that information to your insurance company immediately. Don't put it off.

Lastly, be completely accurate in all of your reports to the company and give the figures as they are. They want to help the committee. We want to help them prepare controls properly. We want to do a good job, but we need the help of everybody. We all will have to get into the fight to hold the cost down. Our travel carrier and our athletic injury carrier want to hold it down as much as we do. They realize each raise in premium has a tendency to push somebody out of the family picture, so to speak. They don't want to do it. We want to hold it down as much as we possibly can. Yet we find—and I am sure all of you agree with me—that it is absolutely essential that we protect our students, protect the program and protect the athletic departments from losses through increases.

I hope that in this short time I have given you a little insight on the plan that was developed. It was a quick résumé and it would take hours to go over the whole thing. I hope it has given you a little bit of understanding of why the cost has gone up so much.

A. L. Sponberg [Augustana (South Dakota) College]: I am here because I am in a situation where it is necessary and very essential to make the most of the least.

I am in my first year as athletic director of a small institution and we are suffering from rising costs perhaps more than most institutions represented here.

I certainly do not have the answers as to what should be done as far as the purchase of equipment and so on is concerned, but my situation I would judge is unique to my own particular institution and may not be relevant to your particular situation.

As a new director, it was my responsibility to look over our budget as it was utilized in the past to find out where we could become more efficient without cutting back our program.

Being a private institution, we have some advantages as far as purchasing is concerned, one advantage being our budget is flexible. I can go to our business manager. He doesn't like to see a grown man cry and once in a while he will consent to purchase items that are not budgeted.

On the other hand, we have a disadvantage in that straight bids either don't come in or we don't always get the advantage of them. But I think this flexibility, if watched carefully, can be worked to our advantage when a particularly good price goes out on items we are utilizing. We can move in and take advantage of these situations.

The other thing is by not having to go on a straight bid basis, it is possible for us to purchase something other than a competitive model. I am sure you people who are necessarily operating on bids may suffer occasionally, although you may gain on the price basis, by not being able to buy quality merchandise you are particularly interested in picking up.

As far as our laundry facilities are concerned, what is there to say? You save roughly 60 per cent by doing the laundry yourselves. In my situation when the equipment was installed it was good equipment. We work jointly with the physical education program and are capable

of using physical education inventory as far as supplies are concerned. We used our athletic board jobs, as we call them. These people do the laundry at roughly \$1.35 an hour. There is no question that we save considerable compared to a contract with a commercial laundry.

One thing that we have done is this. A thing that bothered me a little bit was the walk-off of sanitary units. We can zero in on the coaches and increase security to reduce this, but in the meantime we had just gone to the nylon bag system, where the shirts, shorts, socks and garters were issued to an individual athlete with a nylon bag which was numbered. The system may be used by many of you. We found it to be very efficient, very convenient, and our walk-off has gone down considerably.

The salesman for the nylon bag company suggested that we have two per athlete. We thought that was an unnecessary inventory and restricted it to one bag per athlete, and when the equipment in that bag wears out we replace it. If it is not there, it is up to him to be sure it is replaced. The bags at the end of the practice session are thrown into the laundry hopper and washed early in the morning and dried by nine o'clock and put back into the basket so we save considerable money here. Sweat shirts, track suits and so on we number with the jersey number.

I realize if you use the nylon bag system the shirts don't come out nice and fluffy and are wrinkled and so on, but we think it is better that way.

Another area in our system that was surprising—and being a rookie I suppose it is to be expected—was the tremendous expense in football shoes. We practiced and played in probably as inclement weather as you could find this past season, and right now our shoe inventory is at an all-time low. So we decided to go to canvas practice shoes, which I am sure is not new to anybody, but it seems to me we can get by with less new shoes per year by using the canvas shoes which are washable. The coaches are somewhat favoring the soccer style shoe, but at \$8 apiece the life of these probably will be longer than the high-priced, light leather shoe that we had.

Mr. Hass has touched on the insurance program. This is a beef of mine—it costs us \$600 a month to have doctors at our home contests. This particular month, because of our final examination scheduled and so on, it worked out to \$50 a contest. These doctors are great supporters of our program and it seems to me they might be able to contribute that service, but in order to have a doctor there at all times this is the arrangement we have.

We do get free office calls. Office calls are not charged to our department for athletes who are injured; that is, provided they can go to the office between nine and eleven in the morning. That is for any injury during practice. We wind up paying for emergency service at the hospital. This can be quite expensive.

We include our insurance with the comprehensive fee that covers all of our students. The student has the privilege of waiving the fee. He can sign it and return it. Naturally we clarify all obligations that the student has when he does this, and usually in these cases the parents have an insurance policy at home that covers them, but they are on their own.

This insurance program has been good up until this past year. Evidently the carrier had the same experience the people covering the NCAA had.

We had a boy who injured his knee as a sophomore in high school. He wrestled for our college for two years and then injured his knee quite seriously. He had an operation and there was an insurance problem, and the insurance company refused to pay the claim because he had a previous injury, not related however.

One of the problem areas, it seems to me, that is overlooked in our particular situation is that of equipment repair. One of the important things in equipment inventory cost is that you have to decide whether the equipment should be repaired or replaced.

If it costs 50c to repair a football shoe and nobody wears them it is a waste of money.

We have a tendency to let the equipment deteriorate too far before we make the minor repair of a major piece of equipment. Instead of a little preventive maintenance we have a tendency to let it slide until it requires a major overhaul. Preventive maintenance is the key.

As far as our staff are concerned, there are a few things we try to keep in mind when we buy equipment.

The first question is: Is the intended purchase absolutely necessary?

Secondly, on the number of items and quantity, are we going to save enough money by buying additives, or is the expense going to be clearly a waste of money? Should we buy in bulk lots? Is it worth while to have the inventory?

The big question is quality versus price. That is very difficult to answer because every situation is different. Is the expensive item worth the added investment? Will it be nothing more than a luxury item? We think spending a little more money on most equipment is a good investment, however.

Then there is the real clinker as far as we are concerned: Where should it be purchased? We have a couple of sporting goods dealers in town supposedly backing the program. If you go out of town you lose that supporter, and it is more expensive than to keep it in town. This becomes a serious problem when you do not have a highly competitive market in your local area, which we don't have.

One of the serious pitfalls is that of habitual purchasing. You purchase out of habit without really assessing the particular needs, and then continue to compound that error. We did it last year. This happened to be the brand name we had been purchasing, but it may not best suit the service. Rather than changing, we continued to carry on the type of error that we had in the past.

The other item is the special deal. I would be the first to admit that any time you can get a price break on an item you should take advantage of it, but to take advantage of a price break when you don't really need the equipment is obviously folly and a waste of time. [Applause]

James H. Witham (University of Northern Iowa): The College Committee last year became very concerned with rising costs, especially in regard to traveling squads. This has a tremendous influence on board and room costs while on the road, and traveling via planes, buses or cars.

One of the reasons we must be concerned, however, is that in many instances we are increasing the number of sports in our program.

Costs of the particular programs, all the way from officials to travel, are going up and at the same time gate receipts are being reduced. Parents are not attending athletic contests. You must consider the question of the students regarding the spending of student athletic fees.

In the North Central Conference, we believe scheduling is tied up very closely with the problem. Our coaches have been doing some thinking along this line, particularly in the sports of wrestling, track, golf and tennis, where they are attempting to have more competition, at least meets, without greater cost and without any more loss of the students' time.

In the past year and again this year we have had more "double duals," "triple duals" and tournaments on Saturdays and during vacations, to give us greater competition without having the additional travel expense and overnight expenditures of board and room.

The question the College Committee asked was: Who should set the limit relative to travel cost? We realized a few years ago, under the leadership of some people in the conference, that the number on the traveling squad can be decreased.

So a few years ago, working with the conference, we set some limits. We haven't set them in all sports, only in our spring sports and other sports where we have a conference meet or contest. The number of contestants was set and this had had an influence on members so that during the regular season, they have stayed about within these limits.

We started out with 36 on the travel squad for football. It increased two years later to 38, and we were asked to increase it to 42 because of the specialists, but we turned this proposal down because of the cost.

I heard one athletic director yesterday say they limited their travel squads to 33, and had beaten some teams rather badly and didn't have enough players to substitute to keep the score down. We don't have that problem in our institution.

In basketball we have limited the squads to 12 in conference games. However, in non-conference games in both football and basketball before the conference season starts, we have permitted 42 in football and 15 in basketball. This gives institutions an opportunity to give more people an opportunity to participate.

In baseball, we use the NCAA limitation for the regional and for the national, which is 18, and this seems to have worked well.

However, we permit 33 baseball games; one on Friday afternoon at three o'clock and two on Saturday.

In track, we simply limit participation to three people per event.

However, we find the squads are not large because we do not have the personnel. Many people are doubling or tripling in the various events, and this reduces our traveling squad.

In wrestling, the limit is usually ten, and with the weight limits as they are this year it is always ten. Our coach will usually take a couple of practice people along. We wrestle the University of Minnesota, Iowa and Michigan State, and we usually take two men per event. In other words, 20 people go. This gives the coach an opportunity to work with these people.

Golf teams in the conference meets are limited to six; cross country to seven, and gymnastics to four per event, although doubling up in our institution has caused smaller squads.

Swimming is limited to two people per event, and usually we do not

carry more than 14 or 15 anyway.

We have had to set these limits because of budget limitations. It limits one thing in our athletic program that I do not particularly like; that is, that more students do not get an opportunity to participate.

To try to reduce these costs we have leased a 12-passenger limousine to transport some of the smaller squads. This seems to have worked out rather well. As a result, we hope to purchase at least a couple of these limousines. These are not owned by the athletic department, but are owned by the University. They are used by other departments for travel of one kind or another.

These limousines cost us 20 cents a mile. We have to provide the driver, however, it is much more economical than taking a 29-passenger bus, which costs 50 or 55 cents per mile. We also have 42-passenger buses which are large enough to take our football squad. In some instances we fly, and this has posed a problem because we cannot get the 44-passenger or 48-passenger planes to come to our airport. They are using 90- to 98-passenger planes which means we have to sell the remaining seats to travel by plane. This has created new headaches and new problems.

We do have a bus for 29 passengers, which some of our smaller squads use.

These are some of the ways we are attempting to control additional costs for traveling and trying to keep our travel squads within limitations. [Applause]

Chairman Comer: It is about time that we as responsible people have to take a good hard look in the area of equipment to determine what is actually necessary.

In basketball you have the athlete's name on the scoreboard and his number; you have his name and number on the program, and the coach wants to stick his name on the sweatshirt he wears about five minutes prior to the game, and that costs about \$8.

Some of these things can be eliminated. They do not affect the player in the game, and they cost a lot of money.

There is a lot of waste. Our coach insists on flesh-colored tape. I see some playing with white tape, and there is a lot of difference in the cost.

We have been prey to the desires of the coach in this particular area and we supply what he thinks he has to have to operate. We need to put on the individual what he needs to protect himself, and outside of that we don't have to have such fancy equipment.

Look at the football jerseys with the guy's name on the shoulder, across the back, and he wears it only on Saturday and a new set must be purchased the next year.

Edward W. Malan (Pomona College): We have a basic student insurance policy through the college.

What has been the experience of anyone in our situation who has used NCAA insurance and paid \$1000 deductible and has a kind of catastrophic coverage?

Mr. Hass: Our experience in payment of claims has been very good. I think it will be better with Mr. Richman & Associates. It will mean quick payments.

A player previously injured in high school was hurt one day in football practice at college. The insurance company finally said if he

was in school for a year and had been previously injured they would take care of the injury if it happened again.

As far as the \$1000 deductible, there have been some cases where schools have taken the \$1000 deductible and some other type of insurance to cover the cost up to \$1000. What experience they have had, I am not sure. We took out the straight \$250 deductible on all our sports in the University of Chicago.

Mr. Marshall: We have been in the NCAA insurance program every year since its inception. This year we took the NCAA \$1000 deductible to cover a large area and took the Continental Casualty program with the \$250 deductible. So far our experience has been good. We have had no claim on the NCAA at this point. We have had several on Continental Casualty and they have handled the claims very quickly and without question. I don't know that we have submitted anything that needed questioning, but the checks came back very promptly. My concern is: Will they be able to do this next year or the year after?

Dave Busey of Lycoming College indicated he goes a step further. He has three carriers. I have not had enough experience at this point except to say thus far the Continental Casualty has done a good job for us.

Mr. Witham: At the University of Northern Iowa we have been in this program since its inception. We carried the \$250 deductible which Mr. Hass says costs a small fortune. We found that up to last year, we could very well have taken the \$500 deductible and been covered, using our health service program as much as we do, and saved our initial investment of the insurance cost. This is one place where you can save yourself a little money. We saved about \$3000.

Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Our university requires all students to take out a \$10 policy, a 24-hour policy, to cover them coming to and from school. This is ideal. It also takes care of our physical education accidents, any type of accident whatsoever. It pays up to \$2000.

Now, as a result, it pays money into the athletic department because we take out the \$1000 deductible and with the overlapping we have yet to have any trouble whatsoever. For our institution, the insurance the student takes out has taken care of all our injuries.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I want to share with you our reaction and commend the NCAA Insurance Committee. We entered into a program where every student had to show coverage—Blue Cross or Blue Shield—or if not, we provided through one of our local carriers, a program whereby a student took out insurance to cover him up to \$500, 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, in Europe or any place else. We found that most of them took it out in addition to Blue Cross-Blue Shield or any other coverage.

In that way we had spread out, because this covers males and females. It is mandatory. They were picking up some of the cost of athletic injuries.

Also, our athletic injuries were shared on a "total program" by the drama club or music or anybody else on the staff. If you can pool your resources on the campus with one "total package"—in our program it is up to one million dollars—you will have good coverage.

Mr. Hass: If you can find any place to shave along the line or use the NCAA policy in connection with other policies, that is the thing you

should do. In our particular case, we have a policy for our students, but it does not include intercollegiate athletics. We are fortunate that our health service on the campus will take care of up to \$250, so we are getting complete coverage.

We did have one claim. One boy hurt his knee in football. University of Chicago sent the claim to Mr. Richman; one day later he sent us a notice to be filled out, and we already have a check.

J. William Douglas (Kentucky Wesleyan College): We all recognize why there is an increase in expenditures for athletics. It is something my institution and maybe all institutions will have to cope with in the future. What are we going to do with the rising costs of athletics?

Those who participated in the NCAA cost survey this winter filled out a voluminous questionnaire and returned it. I don't know that it will answer any questions. It may point out where the costs are. I think we all recognized it after we completed the questionnaire.

How are we going to cope with this gargantuan problem?

Mr. Marshall: One way is through better business and budgetary practice.

I am concerned about departmental limitations. If my coach feels that having the boys' names on their backs is going to help him in some way I will try to help him to get them. Maybe I am a little more foolish than you, Lew, and younger and don't know the route very well, but if he can sell me he has to have those names I will help him get them. Maybe a deficit budget of a year or two will correct that situation.

Another method is through curtailment. This we all hate. We don't like to say we will participate with fewer people, but it is necessary in some areas.

The next possibility is to seek other sources of income through promotion.

There is an evolution in college athletics. We in our conference talk about our ten major sports, and we attempt to treat them in similar fashion. We attempt to provide for the students the things they feel they want to participate in. Sometimes the athletic director and the athletic department try to stifle that sort of legitimate request. We are trying to have a good intercollegiate program and still be responsive to the students' interests in terms of sports clubs. It is a part of the whole future of collegiate athletics and we have to be leaders; not forced or dragged into those areas. We try to maintain a position of being able to defend what we do with our students, with our faculty, with our alumni and be a leader in the legitimate trends.

We do not take one cent from students for our aid program. It is wrong for one student working his way through school to put a fee down that provides a scholarship for another student who may not have need. Our money comes from \$40,000 donated money we raise every year and approximately \$45,000 from gate receipts. You may say that is not important. I feel it is. I feel I can justify that to our students.

Richard Colman (Middlebury College): One thing we should recognize is that we are not the only department in the college. We should be very careful to consider the other departments. In an examination of the budgetary situation, it has been proved conclusively that the intercollegiate athletic program is the only department getting a lesser share of the student's dollar than it got before World War II. In every other department the percentage is going up. We have to defend our program very strongly.

Has anybody done anything to cut down the number of officials and the cost of our officials? It has gone up tremendously.

Chairman Comer: I know in our area, the officials' costs have gone up in practically all sports. The officials' associations have become organized to the extent they can practically make a mandatory raise without the institution's being able to do a great deal about it. It is true in our area for such sports as swimming, gymnastics and football.

Mr. Hass: My people say we have to pay so much money to get a good official. In a survey in the Chicago area covering about 35 schools, it was discovered that the same men were working at practically all of these schools at various times. In basketball the fee ran from \$22.50 to \$60 a game, and the same men were working all the places. It was the same thing in other sports.

It is a tough job, and they should be paid and paid well. Maybe somewhere along the line in our organizations we could set a standard for officials' fees. Why should we pay \$50 for a basketball game for the same man who goes to another school and works for \$22.50? Maybe the \$22.50 should come up to our \$50; I don't know. It is something we should look into because there is a lot of money spent in that direction.

Harvey Chrouser (Wheaton College): In the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, we realized we were paying a lot of money for mileage and we went to a regional program to get away from paying officials' mileage, and we are getting pretty fair officiating after a year. If our commissioner wants to bring a team of officials from one region to another for an important game, all the officials travel in one car. We have kept these costs down and it is money we can turn back into the program.

[The session then adjourned at eleven o'clock.]

HONORS LUNCHEON

Tuesday, January 13, 1970

The Honors Luncheon was held in the Presidential Ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., and was called to order by the President, Harry M. Cross, of the University of Washington.

President Cross: On behalf of myself and the members of the staff, I want to recognize not only for the delegates, but others in the room the very excellent work of the executive office personnel in making the arrangements for this affair.

The man who had the primary responsibility for organizing this affair is the director of public relations, Tom Hansen. I have a great affection for him. He was our Pacific-8 Conference public relations director until his ability was discovered in the Midwest and the NCAA swiped him from us. He has a most beautiful wife. In any event, my wife and I take a certain pride in them to the extent that this fall in Kansas City, when Mrs. Cross was able to come with me to the Council meeting, she showed certain grandmotherly type freedoms and Tom Hansen's delightful little girl came to us and raised hell in the house.

But I say to you, Tom, by mentioning you and through you all the others of the staff who do so much so well for us in NCAA—Thanks! [Applause]

It is our good fortune today to have as master of ceremonies a man who for the past four years has been the voice of college football, Chris Schenkel of ABC. It must be noted that our master of ceremonies graduated from Purdue University, of which our honored guest is president. On several occasions he has been voted the best sportscaster in the nation. I want to express to him, for NCAA, our thanks for a job well done during the centennial season. I present to you Mr. Chris Schenkel. [Applause]

[Mr. Schenkel then assumed the chair.]

Toastmaster Schenkel: Mr. President, Members of the NCAA, and all of you: Thank you, Mr. Cross, for mentioning the fact that Dr. Hovde was my leader at Purdue, because it brings back one very important memory.

When I was a terrific freshman, he called me into his office one day. I believe it was for scholastic incompetence or something like that. Anyway, Dr. Hovde, you may remember, I said, "Now that you are president of Purdue, Doctor, you play your cards right and work hard as president, and some day you will amount to something." Boy, you have! We are glad to have him here.

What a great thing for all the member institutions of the NCAA to be so cooperative with all of us at ABC Television. I think I should thank the parents who produced those tremendous young men who play football so well, and I would also like to thank the parents who produced all those beautiful co-eds that we show from time to time on the television screen. I would like to point out that I have nothing to do with any of them; in fact, I don't even know one of them after four years. Bud Wilkinson knows them all. [Laughter]

Speaking of knowing people, the flattery this year in the form of letters following the Texas-Arkansas game—though we had a few that weren't so flattering—had something to do with our halftime interview with President Nixon. All of the letters started out by saying: "Dear Sir: One thing we want to know is, during that halftime interview, who was that curly-haired fellow with Chris Schenkel?" [Laughter]

[Ed. Note: Mr. Schenkel is referring to an interview with President Richard M. Nixon.]

Well, that curly-haired fellow has sent word through his assistant, Bud Wilkinson, that he was unable to be here. He was going to pay us a visit, until he checked with both Secretaries of the Cabinet who are here (it is true he is having an emergency Cabinet meeting). The subject of this particular Cabinet meeting is the budget, so I know you will forgive him for not being here. He sends his very best to all of you.

This ties in very surprisingly with another thing. In Washington, following the luncheon here today, I am meeting with some book reviewers. I have decided to write a book on high finances. It is going to be reviewed this afternoon and presented to the public for the first time. I decided to dedicate it to the Internal Revenue Service. The name of my book is simply this, "Up Your Bracket." [Laughter]

At the conclusion of this football season, it is appropriate to salute the trustees of the American Football Coaches Association because they have played such an important part not only this year, but in the past.

I would like to make note of the fact that the first vice-president is Arkansas's Frank Broyles, and the second vice-president is Earl Edwards of North Carolina State. A little later you will hear from the president, Paul Dietzel, and also the executive secretary, Bill Murray, of that Association.

The third vice-president, and if I know him he is going to work his way up the ladder, is the Bear of the University of Alabama, Paul Bryant. [Applause]

John McKay of Southern California and Duffy Daugherty from Michigan State could not be here.

Here is a very fine coach, Bob Devaney of Nebraska. [Applause]

There is one football team in the country where the coach is still number one with me because the first college football game I broadcast was at Brown University and the quarterback of that team was Joe Paterno of Penn State. [Applause] The coach of that Brown University team allowed me to sit in on a team session, and I thank him for helping me so much, Mr. Rip Engle. [Applause]

I will now recognize the presidents of several affiliated members of the NCAA who are here in connection with your convention.

First is the president of the American Association of College Baseball Coaches and head baseball coach at St. John's University, Jack Kaiser. [Applause]

Next is the president of the College Athletic Business Managers Association, from Michigan State University, John G. Laetz. [Applause]

The president of the College Sports Information Directors of America—and I bow to him because of all the help we get from them—is Harry Burrell from Iowa State University. [Applause]

The president of the National Fencing Coaches Association of America, from the University of Wisconsin, is Archie E. Simonson. [Applause]

Dr. Cross talked about Tom Hansen a moment ago. Last year at the

Honors Luncheon one man at the head table was overlooked, and to make sure this mistake does not happen again and get Tom Hansen in trouble, I am going to introduce him, and you can go ahead and give him a round of applause. He deserves it. He is the executive director of the NCAA—Walter Byers. [Applause]

I bought a Hereford bull for our farm in Indiana. He had everything we look for in the Hereford breed, but he lacked masculinity. It was a terrible drawback. We checked with Governor Tiemann who has been a Hereford breeder. We couldn't find any solution to this problem, because this bull would just lie around the shed and wasn't interested in anything. Actually it was a beautiful cow herd, but he paid no attention. We got bored with the way things were going and last week my brother-in-law who operates the farm, called the veterinarian because he thought the bull needed medication. The veterinarian showed up and looked at the bull and said, "I think I can correct it." He was a little bashful. He shoved a capsule down the bull's throat. Nothing happened for about fifteen minutes, and then that bull took off, out of the shed, and he cleared every fence in the farm and every pass he made was a complete one.

I don't know what was in that capsule, but I can tell you this—it tastes a little like peppermint. [Laughter]

A few years ago a man decided to give me a very nice contract that I might enjoy such things as raising cattle and these extra-curricular activities. Tom Hansen wanted me to put on the NCAA hat and thank him for all the things he has done. I know my boss would like me to do it, but I don't like to do it. We are pleased to be a part of your program.

I have a solution. The best way to keep your job and keep the contract intact is to go to Switzerland and play golf with your boss and make sure he makes a hole in one and you are the only one who saw it. I saw him do it, and I am the only one. We are proud of the NCAA work. Mr. Roone Arledge of ABC Sports. [Applause]

The next introductions involve the NCAA's three-phase award program. First, the recognition of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners, to be followed by the recognition of College Football's All-Time teams, then the presentation of plaques to the governors and members of the Cabinet, and the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

To present the scholarship awards, I would like to bring to the rostrum now the man who was president of the NCAA when this program was inaugurated in 1964-65. He is the Dean of Division of Extension and University Services of the University of Iowa and a member of the NCAA Executive Committee—Robert F. Ray. [Applause]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. Schenkel, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: These honored guests have become a part of the tradition of the NCAA. In the last five years we have honored the business people, people in communication, people in the world of space exploration, people in the world of entertainment and leaders in government and public affairs. All those honored have demonstrated in their lives and in their own special way that they have contributed something to America's greatness, and in the life of each one of them intercollegiate athletics has played an important role.

Today we have four young men with us who represent eighty 1969

NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners. These awards are for \$1000 each. They are made to seniors who are interested in going into the professions or doing advanced graduate work.

The NCAA awards made up to 1969 range in total to 337. Thus the NCAA has made a very substantial investment in the lives of these young men and in the future of our nation.

First of all, I should like to present to you Michael Elston Phipps, who represents the 1969 University Division winners. He will be a 1970 graduate at Purdue University and has a 3.01 grade point average in industrial management. In case some may not know, Mr. Phipps is a football quarterback. He was a member of the Big Ten 1967 All-Academic team, the All-Big-Ten team of 1969, the 1969 UPI All-America team and the 1969 American Football Coaches Association All-Star squad. He was runner-up for the Heisman Trophy and All-America quarterback this year. [Applause]

Next, it is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Alden Stephen Roche. Mr. Roche represents the 1969 College Division Scholarship Winners. He will be graduated in the class of 1970 from Southern University. He has a 3.2 grade point average in electronics. His sport is football, his position defensive end and team captain. He led the team in tackles. He also scored two touchdowns on a pass interception and a fumble recovery.

Mr. Roche plans to do graduate work in electrical engineering at the University of Oklahoma. He was honored by the Pittsburgh Courier which named him a member of its All-America team. [Applause]

The next student is Lawrence Anthony Marzetti, who was a 1966 graduate of Boston College. While there he made the dean's list six times and was elected a member of the All-New England team. He is a native of Washington, D.C. and was graduated cum laude from Boston College. His sport was football where he played quarterback and defensive halfback. He is now at Georgetown University in the final semester of his law course. [Applause]

In order to win an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship, a student must earn at least a 3.000 accumulative grade point average for a period of three years and have performed with distinction in his sport. In addition, each one of the persons selected must have indicated his intention to pursue graduate work and be accepted by a graduate college before an award is made.

Each of these young men has achieved an exceptional college academic and athletic record and demonstrated leadership on his own campus and earned the respect and recommendation of the director of athletics and faculty, a major professor and the dean of the college.

Now it is my pleasure to present to you a gentleman who will respond on behalf of all the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners. He is a 1968 graduate of the University of Georgia. He had a 4.000 grade point average in Chemistry. His sport is football; position, linebacker. He was a member of the All-Southeastern Conference sophomore team in 1965 and the All-Southeastern Conference academic team in 1966. He has been elected to Phi Beta Kappa as the most outstanding junior. He was president of the junior and senior classes. He was valedictorian at the University of Georgia.

He is currently enrolled in the College of Medicine at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine.

Now it is my pleasure to present to you Thomas Walter Lawhorne, Jr. [Applause]

Thomas W. Lawhorne, Jr.: On behalf of the 337 recipients of NCAA Postgraduate Scholarships, I thank you for the more than one-quarter of a million dollars you have provided for us to pursue graduate study.

To me, this program epitomizes some of the fundamentals of college athletics. The primary goal of a young athlete entering the college ranks is to obtain a good education in order to enrich his own fulfillment and to prepare for his life's career. The role of collegiate athletics in emphasizing "the books" first is one of the greatest and most wonderful attributes of the games we all love.

College football is a wonderful institution—the pageantry; the excitement; the challenge; the wholesome competition between schools, conferences and fans; the comradeship among alumni, and the friendships which develop among players and coaches. Then, too, the gridiron may provide us with some of our most valuable education—knowing what it is to be knocked down, but then get up; to hurt and keep on running; or to have to bow your neck on third and one in the fourth quarter with the score tied. These are the things that will help one to become a better teacher, lawyer, doctor, citizen, father, husband—MAN.

Today, both academic and athletic areas are experiencing unparalleled times of competition and specialization. It is quite a responsibility for a university-oriented program to offer opportunities whereby a young man may realize his full potential during four of the most critical and formative years of his life. I think the NCAA is accepting its responsibility and fulfilling its role well.

You know, most of us 337 are young "old has-beens" now, but we thank you, the NCAA, for supporting college athletics and academic scholarship—for teaching us a lot about life and giving us a better start. Thank you. [Extended Applause]

Toastmaster Schenkel: We have a special added feature today. The organizations closely identified with college football joined forces in selecting the All-Time team. The Football Writers Association of America balloted for the team which is sponsored by the Chevrolet Motor Division.

Here representing the FWAA is the most traveled of the football writers because he has truly worked at his job as president of this great association—John Mooney, Sports Editor of the Salt Lake City Tribune. [Applause]

Representing Chevrolet, which has quite an important continuing role in many other ways and is a good friend of college football, is its general sales manager, Robert D. Lund, a native of Minnesota. You probably have seen Mr. Lund on a number of college campuses, presenting Chevrolet's scholarships at institutions of All-Time players on many of our halftime shows last fall. [Applause]

Twelve of the players selected are still living. Eleven members of the modern team survive. Sammy Baugh and Red Grange were unable to be here, but it is my pleasure to present the other nine heroes to you right now. Presenting a special NCAA plaque to the All-Time players present will be Paul Dietzel, president of the American Football Coaches Association, and William D. Murray, executive secretary of the American Football Coaches Association.

First is Jay Berwanger, University of Chicago, 1933-35, known for

his speed and power. He was All-America in 1934 and 1935. His coach, Clark Shaughnessy, said, "He could do more things with a football than anyone else. I never saw Berwanger's equal. He was a better blocker than any lineman." In 1935 Jay Berwanger became the first Heisman Trophy winner and the first college player to be picked in the National Football League draft.

His institutional representative is his former coach, Clark Shaughnessy. [Applause]

Next is Mel Hein, Washington State University, center. Mel was not only the greatest center in the history of college football, but he also excelled in basketball. He was All-America in 1930 and went on to play with the New York Giants for fifteen years.

The institutional representative is Mel's coach, O. E. Hollingberry. [Applause]

Don Hutson, University of Alabama, end. Hutson, called the greatest pass receiver of all time, was also a tremendous defensive player. In the Rose Bowl, he gained 165 yards with two touchdowns on completions of 59 and 54 yards against Stanford. Paul (Bear) Bryant, who played the other end, said, "Don has the most fluid motion I have ever seen. He would look like he was going as fast as possible and suddenly he would put on a fresh burst of speed. He has good hands and excellent moves, but the thing that helped him most was his ability to run in an open field."

His institutional representative is "the other end," Paul Bryant. [Applause]

That is a pair on the golf course, I might add.

Now, Bruiser Kinard, Ole Miss, tackle. Kinard had speed, vitality and love for combat. He was one of the most popular players and coaches in Southern football. He was both the first Mississippian to play in the All-Star Game in Chicago and to be in the Football Hall of Fame.

His institutional representative today is his coach, Ed Walker. [Applause]

Now, Bronko Nagurski, Minnesota, tackle and fullback, 1927-1929. He was a teammate of Dr. Frederick Hovde. In 1929, he was an All-America tackle. Bronko was born with a love for the game of football, which was instinctive. He could play any position. He won top honors as a tackle. As you know, he was also a terrific fullback.

Bronislaw Nagurski's institutional representative is the head coach of Minnesota, Murray Warmath. [Applause]

Ernie Nevers, Stanford University. Nevers, a fullback, came to Stanford in 1942 to begin a career that has become a legend. Clark Shaughnessy said, "Nevers could have broken all records, notwithstanding two broken ankles in his junior year." The Rose Bowl game with Notre Dame still ranks as one of the classics in history. Notre Dame trounced Stanford but they talked mostly of Ernie Nevers' performance.

The institutional representative is Stanford's football coach, John Ralston. [Applause]

Bennie Oosterbaan, Michigan, end, was All-America in 1925, 1926 and 1927. Oosterbaan, a nine-letter man, also starred in basketball and baseball. He had a knack of spearing the ball. In 1927 he became a passer. No team ever succeeded in blocking him. He could carry a ball, kick one, block and tackle. He was an end, halfback and quarterback. What more can you ask?

Oosterbaan's institutional representative is Michigan's athletic director, Donald B. Canham. [Applause]

Jim Parker, Ohio State, is the biggest guard in collegiate football history. Coach Woody Hayes said Jim could block anybody, was great on blocking or tackling, and he gave great protection for the passers. In a defensive play against Northwestern he grabbed a fumble and ran 42 yards for a touchdown. He was All-America in 1955 and 1956 and won the Outland Trophy as collegiate football's best interior lineman. During his career, Ohio State won two Big Ten titles and a national title.

The institutional representative for Jim Parker is the man who had an awesome football team this past season, Coach Woody Hayes. [Applause]

Bob Suffridge, Tennessee guard, is a native Tennessean who was not very large, but he could charge like a streak with a jet engine. His coach, Bowden Wyatt, said, "He had the most powerful defensive charge of any man I have ever seen. On offense he was leading the ball carrier down the field. A lightning charge enabled him to block many punts and tackle the rival quarterback. The opposing teams paid him the highest compliment by trying to run away from his position." He won All-America honors in 1938, 1939 and 1940. He was the recipient of the Rockne Memorial Trophy as the nation's best lineman, in 1940. He was elected to the National Football Hall of Fame in 1961.

With him today is his former teammate, now the athletic director of the University of Tennessee, Bob Woodruff. [Applause]

Now just one more time in this Centennial year of college football, to these members of the All-Time team, will you stand and show your appreciation again? [The assembly rose and applauded.]

Now to respond for the modern All-Time All-America team, here is Don Hutson.

Don Hutson: Mr. Toastmaster, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: Certainly it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to thank the Football Writers Association for selecting us as members of the All-Time team. No one knows better than we what a job this must have been, for we have seen and played with and against many great players. We want you to know that we are fully appreciative, and again we thank you for this honor.

I have been asked to tell you what my participation in athletics has meant to me, and I certainly would have to start out with my education. I went to Alabama on a scholarship. My ambition was to be in business for myself, so I enrolled in the School of Commerce and Business Administration, something I have always been thankful for.

My first venture was a partnership with my roommate, Bear Bryant, in a dry cleaning establishment in Tuscaloosa. I wish I had time to tell you about it. I have had a lot of breaks come my way through my life, and so has Bear, but about that time one of the most important ones for us happened—our manager was hit by a bus. [Laughter] Both of us being sales-minded, you might say like to see things move, we exchanged the dry cleaning plant with the manager for his insurance check. Since then business has been better.

When I talk about competitive sports, I always come back to one thing, and that is competitive experience, wanting to win, to improve yourself no matter what your situation is—spirit, desire. If the thousands of young men in competitive sports now and hundreds of thou-

sands in the years to come acquire just one of these traits, they will have a lot to thank the game for.

In closing, I want to thank the NCAA for inviting the team here and for the honor that you have given us. It has been a very great pleasure for us to attend. Thank you. [Applause]

Toastmaster Schenkel: The Association in the past has honored astronauts, executive officers, top government officials and prominent members of the entertainment industry. For 1970, it was decided to honor the members of the Cabinet and the governors of the 50 states. President Cross and his staff set out to determine how many of these men have participated in intercollegiate athletics. They pictured only a small group would qualify for the honor. To the contrary, they discovered—not surprisingly in my opinion—that two of the 12 Cabinet members and no less than 10 of the 50 governors were qualified.

It is not surprising that the lessons learned in collegiate athletics with discipline and determination helped many of the national leaders and governors to their important positions. These also are the qualities the President looks for when he chooses his Cabinet.

Six of the ten governors are on the dais. Unfortunately, Governor Bartlett of Oklahoma, Governor Rockefeller of New York, Governor McNair of South Carolina and Governor Milliken of Michigan are not among us. Each had his state's legislature opening today or tomorrow and sent regrets that they could not miss that performance.

Appearing on the rostrum to present the plaques is a gentleman with whom I have worked very closely in many different capacities in the NCAA, the present Secretary-Treasurer of your Association from Boston College, Mr. William J. Flynn.

First, the Attorney General of the United States, John N. Mitchell. [Applause] Mr. Mitchell graduated from Fordham University in 1936. As you know, he was sworn in as attorney general in 1969, after a tremendously successful legal career. Prior to that, he served as a Navy officer in motor torpedo boats during World War II.

He is a graduate of Fordham University Law School and did post-graduate work at St. John's University Law School.

At the time of his appointment to the Cabinet, Mr. Mitchell lived in Rye, New York. He is a native of Detroit, Michigan. As you know, he managed President Nixon's successful campaign for the Presidency in 1968.

If you play golf with him, remember he has a low handicap.

The representative of Fordham University is the athletic director, Pete Carlesimo. [Applause]

Now, to the other member of President Nixon's Cabinet, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz, Princeton University, 1942, basketball.

The nation's 11th Secretary of Labor, he was sworn in January 22, 1969. He was most familiar with the activities of the Department, having served three Presidents and three Secretaries of Labor in a variety of capacities since the mid-1950's.

He has been a professor of industrial relations, a labor arbitrator and an author in subjects related to the Labor Department.

He was born in New York City and graduated Cum Laude from Princeton in 1942. He earned a Ph.D. in industrial economics from MIT in 1949.

In between those degrees he served in the Marine Corps in the Pa-

cific, entering the service as a private in 1942 and rising to the rank of major by the time of his separation in 1945.

He is a former member of the MIT faculty.

Athletically, he was a basketball letterman at Princeton. In addition, he earned freshman numerals and two junior varsity letters in football and coached the freshman team during his senior year.

Kenneth Fairman, Princeton's athletic director, is the institutional representative. [Applause]

Now, the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, Warren P. Knowles, Carleton College, 1930, basketball and football.

Now serving his third term, Governor Knowles was first elected in 1964. Previously he was Lieutenant Governor and, before that from 1940 to 1955, was a member of the Wisconsin State Senate.

He was floor leader of the Republican majority from 1943 to 1953. From 1933 to date, he has practiced law with the firm of Doar & Knowles, in New Richmond, Wisconsin.

During World War II he served as a lieutenant in the Navy on the U.S.S. Nevada and, re-elected while in service, he was discharged in 1945 to serve in the Wisconsin State Senate.

He graduated from Carleton in 1930 and earned an LL.B. from the Wisconsin Law School in 1933. He was president of the Wisconsin Alumni Association, 1952-53. His numerous awards cite particularly work in conservation and communications.

At Carleton, where he was a senior class president, Governor Knowles was a starting end in football and stood out on offense and defense, and was a starter on a conference championship basketball team at guard.

Governor Knowles' institutional representative today is Robert Gill, alumnus of Carleton and former director of promotion at that institution. [Applause]

Now, we move west to the Governor of Nevada, the Honorable Paul Laxalt, University of Santa Clara, 1944, tennis.

He is a member of a prominent family in Nevada. Governor Laxalt won personal prominence as an athlete, participating in football, basketball and boxing as well as tennis. His Carson City, Nevada, High School basketball team was the state champion. He was a Golden Gloves boxer, and was twice Nevada State Junior Tennis Champion.

Governor Laxalt earned two tennis letters before his education at Santa Clara was interrupted by service with the infantry in the South Pacific. He then graduated from Denver University School of Law in 1949 and opened practice in Carson City.

In 1950 he was elected district attorney; in 1962, Lieutenant Governor. After narrowly losing a bid for a United States Senate seat in 1964, he was elected Governor in 1966.

Governor Laxalt's institutional representative is Pat Malley, athletic director at Santa Clara. [Applause]

Now the Governor of Minnesota, Harold LeVander, Gustavus-Adolphus, 1932, track and football.

Governor LeVander's rise to the governorship of Minnesota came not through politics but through his distinguished 30-year career as attorney, educator, orator, civic leader and churchman. He was elected in 1967, amassing the largest number of votes in Minnesota history.

Professionally, he practiced law for many years in South St. Paul, where he is a former Chamber of Commerce president and served as

president of a savings and loan association.

His acclaim as a speaker received its foundation when he was an award-winning debater at Gustavus-Adolphus. He was student council president two years, senior class president and graduated Magna Cum Laude in 1932. He earned three letters in football, four letters in track and set a Minnesota collegiate high hurdle record which stood for six years.

He taught speech at Macalester College following graduation while attending the University of Minnesota Law School, from which he was graduated in 1935.

Very active in the Lutheran Church, he was secretary of the National Lutheran Council for three years and served four years as president of the Minnesota Lutheran Brotherhood. He is a member of the board of management of the Tri-Town YMCA.

Governor LeVander's institutional representative today is Lloyd Hollingsworth, athletic director at Gustavus-Adolphus. [Applause]

The Governor of Illinois, Richard B. Ogilvie, Yale University, 1947, football and wrestling.

Governor Ogilvie is another recipient of a Commemorative Plaque whose athletic career was interrupted—then ended—by World War II. He was a varsity grinder and junior varsity wrestler as both a freshman and sophomore, but a knee injury his second season kept him from playing in the late-season Harvard and Princeton games, which was required for a letter at that time.

He then entered the Army, and a serious wound suffered while serving as a tank commander in Europe ended his athletic career. After recovering, he returned to Yale in 1945 and graduated in 1947.

Although he had planned a career as a coach and educator, he entered law school and graduated from Chicago-Lent College of Law in 1949. A member of a prominent Chicago firm, he resigned to join the Justice Department, where he led a fight against Chicago-area mobsters, gaining prominence for his success. He resigned in 1961 to re-enter private law practice, and in November 1962 entered and won the race for Cook County Sheriff.

Here is a man who has never lost a political race. He has done such a good job in this area that he likes to be a winner.

Governor Ogilvie's institutional representative today is the assistant athletic director at Yale University, Jim Holgate. [Applause]

Now, the Governor of Pennsylvania, Raymond P. Shafer, Allegheny College, 1938, soccer, basketball and track.

He was elected Governor of Pennsylvania in 1966. Governor Shafer is one of four governors on the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. He served as the gubernatorial representative on the National Commission for Urban Growth Policy. He was named chairman of the Committee on Crime of the National Governors' Conference for 1970.

Governor Shafer has been an instructor of Business Law at Allegheny College. He entered public service in 1947 when he was elected district attorney of Crawford County. He was re-elected and in 1958 was elected to the Pennsylvania State Senate. In 1962, he was elected Lieutenant Governor.

At Allegheny he was student body president, president of his class each year, Phi Beta Kappa, and captain and leading scorer in basketball,

as well as a letterman in soccer and track.

Governor Shafer's institutional representative is John Chuckran, football coach at Allegheny College. [Applause]

Now, the Governor of Nebraska, Norbert T. Tiemann, University of Nebraska, 1949, football.

Governor Tiemann is serving his first term as governor after his election in 1966. He is a native of that state.

Like several other honorees, his athletic career was interrupted by World War II. After starring in three sports at Campbell High School, he earned a freshman football letter before entering the Army in March 1943.

He then played on the Camp Lee football team, the regimental basketball team and Fort Warren's championship volleyball team. He also "lettered" in more serious action, participating in the landing at Leyte and in the first wave at Okinawa. He suffered disabling injuries, however, which prevented him from participating other than in intramurals when he returned to Nebraska in 1946.

At Nebraska, he was president of Beta Sigma Psi fraternity and Kosmet Klub. He graduated in 1949 from the College of Agriculture, a field in which he now is an expert. He was a county agent, then assistant manager of the Nebraska Hereford Association.

Since his election, the state has inaugurated a program of state aid for elementary and secondary schools and junior colleges, as well as cities and towns.

Representing the University of Nebraska is its sports information director, Don Bryant. [Applause]

Now, Responding on behalf of the honored governors is Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of Pennsylvania.

The Honorable Raymond P. Shafer: Mr. Toastmaster, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: I know I speak for every one of my fellow governors when I say thank you for honoring us today.

The exploits of our collegiate days, of course, grow with the passing of each year, but we are more honored by being asked to participate in this wonderful luncheon where we are honoring the truly great athletes of all time.

I don't have to tell this distinguished audience what competitive athletics means to our country. I just wish that every young man and young woman in this country could have heard Tom Lawhorne or could have heard the beautiful invocation of Chaplain McComas. Both of these discourses say much more eloquently than any one of us can say what competitive athletics means to the United States of America—respect for others, leadership, self-discipline, all of the things that mean progress for our country.

Very frankly, I am also pleased to be here today and to be on the same team with President Nixon for a change. [Laughter] As you know, we have had a slight argument as to which was the number one collegiate football team in the country. Even though we are here today and you have heard from the President, I want you to know that our differences are still not settled. [Laughter] Penn State is still Number One.

All of the governors you have seen I believe have participated in this new television program called "The Governor and J. J." and having seen the program you know that we are not going to change our profession. However, Joe Paterno, the coach of the great Penn State team

and I decided to start a program in Pennsylvania, "The Governor and J.P." You know what J.P. stands for. That is Italian for Governor too.

I want to pay tribute to the NCAA for continuing every year its great interest in intercollegiate athletics, in competitive athletics, in making sure that we in America have the finest anywhere in the world. Thank you very much. [Applause]

Toastmaster Schenkel: Speaking for the Cabinet members is the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable George P. Shultz.

The Honorable George P. Shultz: Mr. Schenkel, Distinguished Governors, Scholarship Winners, and Fellow Admirers of these All-Time Greats: My feelings today are very much like those I experienced when the President called me to Washington a year ago; equal parts of pride and puzzlement. All I could say was, "Why me?" Now after 12 months in Labor, I realize that it was because of my experience in blocking.

Next, I believe that some kind of archeological award should go to the NCAA Honors Committee for excavating the records of the early 1940's. In Ivy League blocking and passing, I used to carry the ball to and from the dressing room. I do not regret the experience. My years of football at Princeton were a good foundation for my present job. I learned the joy of victory and I learned the agony of defeat. We usually lost to everyone else.

I thought I left contact sports behind me when I left Princeton, but I have learned otherwise in the past year, and I am glad I kept in contact. I am glad also that all our games are not being played in Philadelphia. That is a sideshow.

When the going gets rough, we have a lot of coaches on the sidelines more than willing to call the play.

The NCAA Honors team should be penalized for having 12 men on the field.

Let me say thank you, and a special salute to these great All-Timers on behalf of the Attorney General and myself. And I now return to my warm seat on the bench. [Laughter and applause]

President Cross: It is now my distinct honor to present the Theodore Roosevelt Award. This is the highest honor NCAA can bestow. It was named after President Roosevelt because of his concern which led to the formation of this Association in 1906. In addition, he was a strong advocate of physical fitness and the benefits of competitive sports.

The criterion covering the award states: "The Theodore Roosevelt Award is the highest honor the National Collegiate Athletic Association may confer on an individual. It is presented annually to a distinguished citizen of national reputation and outstanding accomplishment who, having earned a varsity athletic award in college, has by his continuing interest and concern for physical fitness and competitive sport and by the example of his own life exemplified most clearly and forcefully the ideals and purposes to which college athletic programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated."

On the program you have the names of the jury of distinguished citizens who make these selections.

There are a few other details about the award in the program, but I will not take the time to give them. I want to save the time to tell you about the honoree.

Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University, is a graduate of the University of Minnesota.

As a student-athlete in Minnesota, he was the leading football scorer in the Big Ten Conference in 1928. He was a member of the All-Big Ten football team in 1928 and the All-Western football team that same year.

In 1932, he was assistant director of the General College of the University of Minnesota. In 1936, he became assistant to the president of the University of Rochester. In 1941, he went overseas as head of the London Mission of the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

He moved to the position of executive assistant to the chairman of the National Defense Research Commission in 1942 and in 1943 became chief of Division 3.

Dr. Hovde became president of Purdue in 1946.

He holds 16 honorary degrees from colleges, including Oxford. He has served on many government research and development councils and has been a member of the President's Committee on Education. He received the President's Medal for Merit and the King's Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom.

Under his leadership over the past 20 years the College of Engineering's total population has quadrupled, and the advanced education of the University has greatly expanded as is reflected in the growth of the Graduate School.

Dr. Hovde, on behalf of the NCAA, recognizing your great and wonderful accomplishments, I present this award to you.

[The audience rose and applauded as the award was presented to President Hovde.]

Frederick L. Hovde (Purdue University): Toastmaster Schenkel, President Cross, Distinguished Members of the Cabinet, Distinguished Governors of our States, the Members of the All-Time Team, Delegates to the National Collegiate Athletic Association: I am, of course, deeply honored to receive this award. As I told my wife when the news came, "Isn't it wonderful to be given an award of this kind for doing things that you liked to do when you were young?" And for that matter, doing things that I have enjoyed doing ever since the days of competitive athletics.

Throughout my professional working life, which I have been privileged to spend at three different universities, I have indulged my deep lifetime interest in amateur athletic sports. This has been a privilege and an honor for me, because all of you present in this room know the important part that athletics and games, properly conducted, play in our society. They are an important element of our country.

It seems to me that this Association, representing, as it does, more than 700 of our collegiate institutions, has a more important task in legislating the policies and regulations that govern this part of our society than ever before. I hope that you will preserve and protect this great part of our life to the best of your ability.

I would like at this time to say to President Moos, my longtime friend and president of my alma mater, the University of Minnesota, that I greatly appreciate his coming. I have in my heart and my mind a thankfulness for what the University of Minnesota did for me as a young man, which I can never repay, because it gave me the opportunity to participate on teams representing that great university back in the 1920's, that interesting decade which has lots of parallels to the decade of the past. The University of Minnesota was at that time a magnifi-

cent university, one of our greatest state universities, filled with interesting people, interesting ideas, and in the usage of that day, on the go. I am proud to have had the opportunity to represent that University.

I am particularly pleased today to meet a teammate, my friend and a man I have admired ever since I first met him, Bronko Nagurski. I wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for the Bronk, because many times he picked me up. He constituted my protection against some of the evil tackles who I ran against. [Laughter]

It seems to me that in the management of the affairs of men in this society and all societies, the strain is always on the character and never on the intellect. If you give some thought to that little statement, I think you will agree with me. The strain is always on the character and never on the intellect, for our knowledge is great about man and nature and society and all the things we need to know, but our ability to manage our affairs puts a strain on the character. And where is this more true than in the field of the management of intercollegiate athletics?

This is a deep concern to all of us who love the game; love it for its fundamental contribution to people who play the game and to the society which nurtures our colleges and universities and our recreational athletic program.

It seems to me that the principal lesson a young man learns in participation is, of course, that the young of the species are like the young of all species, they love to play games. Thus it follows that sports is the first place a young man learns that to succeed and develop himself as a person, to develop his talents, requires the basic ingredient of self-discipline. This is where the young man first learns the basic requirements that are imposed on all men if they would develop themselves. I have never in my life met a man in any profession who succeeded and was competent in his job who did not give to his personal development this motivating quality of self-discipline.

Nowhere is self-discipline more important these days than in the team that represents the university, or all teams for that matter, because no team can succeed unless its members are willing to discipline themselves to the requirements not only of the game itself, but also of playing the game with other people.

I have long believed the amateur code which we inherited from our English forebears along with other things of our society, is a fine, good and wonderful code. Its erosion through the years is a matter of deep concern to me. It is a matter of deep concern to this Association. I think it is up to this Association, to the delegates and management of this fellowship, to do everything in your power to protect and preserve this code. It is the code of conduct that makes life worth living for men who work and play together.

We live in a highly competitive society. The demands of competition are demands that strain to the utmost the human talents, and the penalty for failure is great. But the benefits from a free competitive society are greater than those of any other kind of society that we have seen or in which we have participated.

It seems to me that the kinds of things that this Association is concerned with are serious and important: The erosion of the amateur spirit of the code, the recent injection of external social issues into the management of our teams.

Certainly in our American system there is no activity in which a man

must prove himself as an individual, regardless of race, creed or color, equal to participation on an intercollegiate athletic team. The injection of these external social issues into this particular scene in recent years is, in my judgment, a disservice to all the people who are interested in intercollegiate sports in this country.

The financial questions involved are of great concern.

There are some good things on the other side of the ledger. One of these is a new trend and renewed interest in the whole field of physical education, and in the training of the men who will be the coaches in our schools throughout the nation.

There once was a great deal of intellectual snobbishness with respect to various curricula. Intellectual snobbishness denies the intellect itself. But I am glad to report there is a new and renewed interest in the value of the part to be played on the football field and in all athletics in the physical education of our nation.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if in the planning of our primary and secondary schools throughout the country, and in certain places particularly, we had the vision and the support of the right kind of coaching and the right kind of athletic facilities to provide this kind of learning along with the academic learning which is so important? Both would benefit and the whole nation would benefit. These things are coming. We should give our attention to the improvement of the whole environment of our people, to changing all our activities and the purpose of all these things we do for our young people.

From these points of view there are some things we can look forward to if we have the will and if we work together. I ask this Association to turn its attention to the constructive things, the development of more and better physical education as a very important part of our national health, and to find ways and means of financing the facilities, coaching and leadership — all the things that are necessary to the physical, mental and moral development of our young people, to get them started early enough so they have the opportunity as boys and young men to develop self-discipline.

In this spirit I accept this award and thank you from the bottom of my heart for it. [Applause]

President Cross: To receive the award on behalf of President Hovde's undergraduate institution and to respond for his alma mater, here is the president of the University of Minnesota, Dr. Malcolm Moos. [Applause]

Malcolm Moos (University of Minnesota): President Cross, Toastmaster Schenkel, Distinguished Members of the Cabinet, Governors, Members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association: It is an embarrassment of riches to be in this gathering today if you will pardon me, to have Bronko Nagurski, Bud Wilkinson, Fred Hovde and Governor LeVander all in one pocket from the University of Minnesota.

Since Governor Shafer faintly touched on politics, I want to give you some assurance, as the last speaker, that we are fortunate that former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey is not with us today. [Laughter]

Ladies and gentlemen, Fred Hovde stands tall in the pantheon of gridiron fame, but he likewise stands tall in the world of scholarship and the world of education, because the regents of the University of Minnesota tried to hunt him down and bring him back from Purdue to

become president of the University of Minnesota. In great despair and disappointment they finally had to extend their search until they could bag a moose. [Laughter]

I would like to speak very briefly about the symbolics of the importance of this occasion. It seems to me eminently correct, as it should be, that this is the Theodore Roosevelt Award, because far in advance of his time in this happy continent, as it must and should be, he stood for environmental sciences when it was just dimly seen by most people and certainly not by others in public affairs. He understood the need of doing things in the urban environment and their relation to nature and conservation and natural resources. With that he saw side by side the importance of sports, athletic competition, and indeed as the people who engage in sports relate to the environment of the nation.

It was Emerson, the founder of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, the great essayist, who told us, "A great man is somebody who doesn't remind you of somebody else." It seems to me this is what we see when we look at the catalogs of the greats in the world of sports. If you look at the All-Time football team sitting in front of me this afternoon, stylistically they were all different. They did not remind you of anyone else, as well as the men who sit here on the dais with me today, each representing his own style and it is never comparable—Bennie Oosterbaan of Michigan, Ernie Nevers of Stanford, Bud Wilkinson, Fred Hovde, Frank Kinard, Bronko Nagurski and so many others you might mention. So although they participated as individuals, they involved individualism which must never sink from sight in these United States, and at the same time they involve the kind of spirit, the teamwork which so many of you spoke of this afternoon.

Fred Hovde, my great friend, spoke to the fact that they take part in athletics because they like to, and we shouldn't I suppose feel sorry for them. In a way, in our universities the professors get paid to read the books they want to read, and I feel there is nobody who should feel sorry for himself for the opportunity to participate. It seems to me the university, sports and the halfback all go together.

When we look back over our shoulders, or if we look ahead, I think we can agree that the gridiron generation gap has produced only admiration, pride and respect, along with a clear faith in the future; not mockery, not blind destruction, despair or disenchantment.

One of the great things in which we are remiss in some of our problems today, is childhood without boyhood and childhood without girlhood. Children are suddenly put in a complex society without the great living experience that sports have always harbored in the opportunity for development.

Gentlemen, embark on the next storm-swept years, in the century ahead, with a stout heart, standing taller, as the men we honor today. Thank you. [Applause]

Toastmaster Schenkel: Ladies and gentlemen, I thought we were starting out a pretty strong Purdue day.

You probably thought I forgot to introduce a man who is very close to me, and I did not. I saved him until last because with all the excitement on the games we televise, one of the great ingredients of NCAA football on television is the fact that this man has an honorary degree, called Class, for telecasts, in the athletic world. He is here in Washington as a Presidential Assistant, Charles D. (Bud) Wilkinson. [Applause]

As you go on to your convention forums, don't forget to pat these people on the back—Asa Bushnell, Jack Mollenkopf, Jack Curtice, Frank Howard—for many years in athletics, who are giving up their career. Let them know you appreciate what they have done.

The games this year were very exciting. I think the most exciting moment was at the Hula Bowl the past weekend. As you know, the folks there dedicated the game to Fred Steinmark, the Texas player whose leg was amputated just before the end of the season. At half-time a call came to our booth from Houston, Texas. It was Fred Steinmark calling Bud and me. He hoped we would tell the people of Hawaii how appreciative he was of the fact that they had dedicated the game to him. He is a tremendous young man.

Last night proved a great byproduct of football. We have seen different byproducts with these men today, but last night about 5000 people in Austin, Texas, at the end of the Longhorn Award Banquet, saw Fred Steinmark walk across the stage without help, without crutches, without a cane after his operation only one month ago—walk unassisted to receive his award on his new artificial leg, and I am sure football had a great deal to do with that.

Thank you very much for inviting me. I am sorry I didn't have a more happy philosophy. Maybe I do before I go. I travel a lot, as you do. I always remember when I go home to bed, not to talk in my sleep. Thank you very much. [Applause]

Captain R. F. McComas: Let us bow our heads.

Eternal God, ere we depart this place, we turn our thoughts again to Thee. We are humble that we have shared in the honoring of these distinguished men. May the example of their service to Thee and our country help inspire and strengthen our witness to those truths which ought to be more evident in our national life. May our use of time and talents reflect our concern for those matters which are vital to man.

May you, almighty one, strengthen us and fortify us with courage equal to the requirements of our responsibilities. May you, all-gracious one, enlighten us regarding the eternal verities and the rewards of true service. May you, the only abiding presence, give us all a sense of peace and well-being, the great assurance rooted in love and life that is indestructable. Amen.

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Morning, January 14, 1970

The Business Session convened in the Presidential Ballroom at 9:10 a.m., Harry M. Cross, University of Washington, President of the Association, presiding.

President Cross: I declare the business session in order.

There is no way, of course, to identify how rapidly we may be able to proceed with our business, but in order to avoid the awkwardness that developed a couple of years ago, I want each and every one of the delegates to know that the parliamentarian and I have agreed that any business transaction this morning is subject to the ordinary rules of review and reconsideration until it has been voted to close the Convention, whether it is after lunch or not. If something happens this morning that you like or dislike and you leave at noon in the anticipation that it may be closed, you are now forewarned that may not be so.

7. REPORT OF THE TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Forest Evashevski (University of Iowa): Mr. President, all delegates received the Report of the Television committee at registration.

The charge to the Television Committee is (1) to bring fine college football to the television viewers and (2) to protect the hundreds of games played on college fields from the harmful effects of unlimited televised football.

The 1969 Television Committee is pleased to report that both college attendance and the television ratings increased in 1969, as shown in this report.

There is special information on page 35 covering the new plan and the reason for its creation, and my letter to you, Mr. President, of April 15.

I move that this plan and report be accepted by the membership. [The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

8. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

President Cross: It seems desirable to act on Amendments Nos. 12 and 13 (pages A-5 and A-6) because they concern the effective date of the legislation.

I now ask unanimous consent of the Convention to modify the order of procedure by making Amendments No. 12 and 13 the first two to be considered.

Delegate: I so move. [The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Amendments

Samuel E. Barnes (Howard University): President Cross and Members of the Convention: Amendment No. 12 proposes to add the following to Article 9 of the Constitution: "Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of September following adoption by the Convention."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, I propose an amendment to the proposed amendment to read as follows: "Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention."

I move the adoption of Amendment A. to Amendment No. 12. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of these amendments is to establish a new effective date for legislation and to control the effective date of all the amendments adopted at this convention.

President Cross: In regard to the amendment changing the date to August 1 rather than September 1, the attention of the Council was called to the fact there are some institutions which commence before the first of September and if you have legislation effective on September 1, intended to be applicable at the beginning of the school year and the school year of this institution started two or three days or more before September 1, that would frustrate the purpose of the Convention in adopting the amendment for the whole year.

An illustration given was legislation that requires a three-day warm-up before the start of football practice. If an institution starts football practice under the permissible rule sometime in August and on September 1 the requirement changes, the very purpose would be totally frustrated because three or four days would have elapsed before the effective date.

[Amendment A to Amendment No. 12 was passed by voice vote.]

[Amendment No. 12 (page A-5), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Barnes: Mr. President, it is proposed to amend Article 9 of the Bylaws to establish an effective date of legislation and to add the words: "Unless otherwise specified all amendments shall become effective on the first day of September following adoption by the Convention."

I move that this be adopted. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, in light of the circumstances surrounding the last amendment, I propose Amendment B to Amendment No. 13 to read as follows: "Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention."

I move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

[Amendment B to Amendment No. 13 was approved by voice vote.]

[Amendment No. 13 (page A-6), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Principles of Ethical Conduct

Francis E. Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): Mr. President and Delegates: Amendment No. 1 (page A-1) relates to Article 3 of the Constitution, Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics, specifically to Section 6, Principles of Ethical Conduct. (Mr. Smiley read the proposed addition.)

I move the adoption of this amendment.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.]

Stan Bates (Washington State University): President Cross and Members of the Convention: Your Council and Association has seen fit to require certification of certain all-star games and bowl games. There are several pieces of legislation that will come before the

Convention to strengthen this program, and the first is the addition of a paragraph to Constitution Article 3, Section 6, by adding paragraph (c). (Mr. Bates read the proposed language.)

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment.

[The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried, 254-9.]

Glenn J. Drahn (Coe College): I would like some information. Technically speaking, the word "indirectly" could implicate a lot of people unknowingly in this situation. As an athletic director and football coach, I fill out many forms which are requested by many different organizations. Some are used indirectly for selection of teams. Technically speaking, our coaching staff would be in violation of this legislation. How are we to treat this situation?

Mr. Bates: I don't know that I have the definition of the term "indirectly." I suppose almost any legislation we refer to in an indirect manner. Certainly it was not the intent of our committee to have any disagreement with the ordinary actions of the athletic director or any other person connected with the university. Certainly, our intent was not to interfere with normal procedure.

President Cross: Direct participation would be clear enough. Indirectly would appear to be designed to avoid participation by subterfuge and violation of the rule. If you have ordinary identification of ability and things of that sort it would hardly be within the scope of this legislation. Would you agree with that, Stan?

Mr. Bates: Yes.

Five-Year Rule

J. Ralph Tibbetts (State University of New York at Albany): Amendment No. 3 (pages A-1 and A-2) is to Article 3, Section 10-(a) of the Constitution, adding to the five-year rule the words "or out of college on the direction of a competent physician due to illness."

Mr. President I move the adoption of this amendment. [The motion was seconded.]

Frank Carver (University of Pittsburgh): The Council opposes this amendment. There is legislation already on the books which will take care of the five-year student and this proposal would in effect open the door to a lot of exceptions.

Alfred C. Werner (State University of New York at Albany): Mr. President, I feel this amendment should be approved for these reasons.

Less than 20 hours ago in this same room, we heard from prominent persons in government as well as within our educational institutions who spoke of the wonderful opportunity given a student to participate in intercollegiate athletics. At the same time it was recognized in the appearance of the All-Time Football team that these were individuals and that we should treat them as individuals.

I propose in this amendment that we give additional time to a student who has been advised by competent medical authority to delay his education—and this is certainly beyond one year because our present five-year rule time would take care of that. This young man may be a future governor, a future Cabinet member, and even a future President of the United States.

Robley C. Williams (University of California, Berkeley): The gentleman who spoke on behalf of the Council, opposing this legislation, stated that the present legislation takes care of these exceptions. It is quite unclear to me in what sense the present legislation does take

care of them. As I understand the present legislation, the Council has no authority whatsoever to waive except for the two or three items specified in the Constitution. As I understand it now, a boy who has had his education delayed because of serious illness has no chance whatsoever of receiving a waiver under the five-year rule.

Am I correct in my interpretation?

President Cross: Yes. I believe Mr. Carver's principal point was that in most situations the fifth year is going to take care of the problem when the doctor orders him to stay out of school.

[Amendment No. 3 (pages A-1 and A-2) was defeated by voice vote.]

Principles Governing Individual Eligibility

Raymond T. Ellickson (University of Oregon): Mr. President and Delegates to the Convention: I move that Article 3, Section 10-(c) of the Constitution be amended by the adoption of Amendment No. 4 (page A-2) which adds the following: "A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team." [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, in the light of discussion with the people at the Convention, I get the impression this is very noncontroversial and for that reason I will speak to it only briefly.

This arose out of a situation in my district where two or three student-athletes were involved, on bad advice from their high school coach, in a high school alumni game, which is of course constituted participation in organized outside basketball competition, although that is the kind of basketball competition which does more good than harm. For that reason, I recommend the adoption of this amendment.

[Amendment No. 4 (page A-2) was approved, 272-29.]

President Cross: It is my understanding that the proposer has asked to withdraw Amendment No. 5. I ask now if Bill Wall of MacMurray College will verify that.

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): I wish to withdraw it.

President Cross: Is there objection to its withdrawal? Evidently there is none, and it is withdrawn.

John Kane (University of Arkansas): I am not certain what the procedure is to have an item made effective immediately, but I raise the question that it might be well to have Amendment No. 4 go into effect immediately. Otherwise it would not be in effect during the rest of the season.

President Cross: We think it is permissible to move that this become effective immediately and if the Convention adopts the motion it will be so ordered.

Mr. Kane: Mr. President, I move that Amendment No. 4 become effective immediately [The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): I move that Article 3, Section 10-(c) of the Constitution be amended by adding the three words "or Maccabiah Games" to give the NCAA Council authority to waive the restriction against organized outside competition in basketball in the case of the Maccabiah games. [The motion was seconded.]

I understand there may be a move to table this amendment. In the light of the consideration of other international competitions, I urge that the Convention favorably act upon this at this time, since the issue is so prominent today and because the competition is legitimately

amateur. The competition is very definitely significant, and it is the goal of all of us to promote games with institutions in other countries. It would be inconsistent not to act at this time.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, I wish to make two comments concerning the motion just made by Mr. Peters.

First, this proposal I believe is untimely. At the present time there is pending before your Council a case involving an infraction where this rule is in question. One of the institutions that proposes the amendment is the institution involved in this infraction.

This matter was originally scheduled for hearing as you know, prior to the meeting of this Association, but at the request of the president of the institution involved we delayed this matter until after the meeting and it set for Thursday (tomorrow).

It is for this reason, Mr. President, I believe this matter is untimely. It amends legislation upon the request of an institution involved in an infractions case prior to the hearing on the matter. What we do under the rule does not make any difference one way or another as the rule was in effect at the time the action took place.

Secondly, the Maccabiah Games took place last year. I also understand they will not be held for another four years or until 1973. For this reason I do not believe it is urgent that it be considered.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move this matter be tabled until the next meeting of the Association. [The motion to table Amendment No. 6 (page A-3) was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

Tom H. Niland (LeMoyne College): I move that the Convention amend Article 3, Section 10-(c), by the adoption of Amendment No. 7 (pages A-3 and A-4). [The motion was seconded.]

This is not a very light situation. It was sponsored by the first assembly in the East. A committee was formed by the Eastern College Basketball Association athletic directors for release from the restrictions. The committee met several times and investigated the reasons behind the present rule. Of course, we know why the restrictions were placed at that particular time. Since that time we also feel there has been a penalty placed on a great many college basketball players, of which there are probably 10,000 in the United States.

We feel there should be some relief and there is no reason why the youngster cannot play in the playground. So the committee met and attempted to draw up a resolution that would be restrictive, yet permit a youngster to play during the summer and still avoid the pitfalls that took place before. It is more restrictive on basketball than on any other sport.

Again, I want to point out that the institution must give permission, so it is not a blanket rule. It must be registered, and we feel it is a wise thing to allow legitimate outside competition during the summer months in organized, supervised play.

Frank Carver (University of Pittsburgh): The Council voted to oppose this legislation. The reasons for which the restriction was put on summer basketball, out-of-season basketball, 10 years ago were very valid at that time. We have no reason to believe that conditions today are any different and therefore we cannot support the amendment.

James H. Decker (Syracuse University): I have been asked by the Eastern College Athletic Conference to point out in this connection that it was impossible for the ECAC to sponsor this legislation because

no meeting was scheduled in time to include it. However, at a special meeting yesterday, the ECAC went on record overwhelmingly in favor of this legislation.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): Speaking as president of the Eastern College Basketball Association, it is my responsibility to report that the Eastern College Basketball Association voted 224 to 17 to support this legislation.

Mr. Niland: Mr. President, Mr. Carver said the Council felt the situation is still the same. We say the situation is not the same under this particular rule. We are making it a legitimate supervised situation. We are not allowing the youngster to play with more than one team. We are not allowing him to play with any member of the college team in games where money is paid. We are making it quite restrictive. In the other situation you had 10,000 college youngsters playing basketball and you had to restrict them. Ten years ago they did something that was illegal. I think we are going a little bit off the track.

Ernest B. McCoy (Pennsylvania State University): It is important to go just a little further into the background of our present legislation. I am sure many of you remember this program longer than ten years ago, when we had similar legislation. I believe the same statement was made. You recall the gambling in basketball.

These gentlemen if I may use the term, admittedly are looking for every opportunity to get at one, two, three or a few more youngsters. Many of the people in this room have had discussions concerning this problem.

You may recall also the indictment in the newspapers and in the news media, that if the colleges through their athletic departments do not control the youngsters then basketball should be thrown out and no longer played in our colleges and universities. I am sure all of you have read some of those indictments. This is not new.

I hope that you defeat this proposal. Since the current legislation was put on the books, we have not had any recurrence. I don't think we should increase the opportunity for these people to get at these kids.

Mr. Niland: Again I would like to point out that the members of this committee are the very same persons who had experience in basketball and were involved in the situation. This is not similar legislation. This is far from similar legislation. It is not a fair comparison.

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): As Vice-President of the National Association of Basketball Coaches, I was so advised by letter by the group that this proposal was discussed at our meeting which was made up of delegates from the districts and athletics representatives and they did not endorse the legislation. The NABC Board is not in favor of this legislation.

[Amendment No. 7 (pages A-3 and A-4) was put to voice vote and defeated.]

Forest Evashevski (University of Iowa): Mr. President, Amendment No. 8 is a proposal to add paragraph (f) as follows: (Mr. Evashevski read the text of the Amendment which appears on page A-4.)

Mr. President, this is proposed because the Extra Events Committee at various times has had reason to question expenses of the promoting bodies and it had reason to question the gate. It also found improper insurance coverage for those who participated and also had reason to question the character of some of the people promoting the contests.

It is my belief after serving on the Extra Events Committee that without this backing the student should not participate.

I move the adoption of this proposal.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President and Members of the Association: I move the adoption of Amendment No. 9 (pages A-4) to Article 3, Section 10 of your Constitution which adds a new paragraph (b). [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this amendment actually clarifies what presently exists. Article 7B, which you will find in the Bylaws on page 46, provides that "No member institution shall be represented or permit its student-athletes to compete in any track and field meet which is not sponsored, promoted (or certified) by the Association."

We are proposing to clarify this matter and bring it into Article 3 of the Constitution. A statement in that section will make it much more clear to the institutions involved that a student-athlete shall not represent the institution if he is ineligible for this reason.

It makes little or no difference because in the present legislation the individual still cannot compete and the individual still is in violation.

What this does further is place the responsibility on the student-athlete in that he is ineligible. Under the present legislation there is a possibility that a student-athlete could go to another institution and the first institution he attended might be penalized for allowing him to compete, but if he went to another institution he could continue to compete and the second institution would not be in violation of the rule. This proposal would make him ineligible, so the individual student-athlete will be much more likely to inquire and to be responsible for whether or not the event he is going to participate in has been certified by the Association.

[Amendment No. 9 (page A-4) was put to voice vote and approved.]

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 10 (pages A-4 and A-5) to Article 3, Section 10, of the Constitution which adds a new paragraph. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this amendment has exactly the same intent I mentioned before except it applies to gymnastics. All the rest of the language is the same.

[Amendment No. 10 (pages A-4 and A-5) was approved by voice vote.]

Vice-Presidents' Reports

James R. McCoy (Ohio State University): Mr. President and Delegates: I move the adoption of Amendment No. 11 to Article 5, Section 3-(c)-(2) of the Constitution, to delete the requirement that each district vice-president shall render a report in writing to this Convention. [The motion was seconded.]

Briefly, the capability of the Association office to carry on the necessary survey and research and the publication possibilities in the monthly NCAA News has, in my judgment, rendered the annual reports in writing unnecessary.

[Amendment No. 11 (page A-5) was approved by voice vote.]

Transfer of Membership

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 14 (page A-6) which is to Article 1, Section 4 of the Bylaws, and will permit West Virginia University to

transfer its membership from District 3 to District 2.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

Milton F. Hartvigsen (Brigham Young University): Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I move the adoption of Amendment No. 15 (page A-7), amending Article 1, Section 4; to transfer New Mexico State University from District 6 to District 7.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

I further move the adoption of Amendment No. 16 (page A-7) which transfers Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington, from District 8 to District 7.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

Mr. President, I request permission to amend Article 1, Section 4, to transfer Boise State College, Boise, Idaho, from District 8 to membership in District 7.

President Cross: The request is for unanimous consent of the Convention to put this item before us. In absence of objection, you can make your motion.

Mr. Hartvigsen: Mr. President, I move that Boise State College be given membership in District 7. [The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

Committees

Earl M. Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Mr. President and Members of the Convention: Proposal No. 17 (page A-7) amends Article 3 of the Bylaws so it will correspond to the Constitution. Constitution 4-3-(c) provides that members of the general committees shall be on the staff of active or allied members of the Association. This is an editorial change only and is not a change of policy.

Mr. President, I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and approved.]

Amendment No. 18, Mr. President, proposes the addition of one at-large member to the NCAA Olympic Committee, and adjusts the terms of the 10 members to coincide with the terms of the U. S. Olympic Board of Directors. The basis for this is the U. S. Olympic Committee's authorization of 10 representatives of the NCAA on the Board of Directors.

Mr. President, I move adoption of this amendment.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Jesse T. Hill (University of Southern California): Mr. President and Members of the Convention, Amendment No. 19 (page A-8) is to Article 3, Section 2-(a). I move the adoption of this amendment. [The motion was seconded.]

Amendment to Amendment C (page A-9) should read as follows: (Mr. Hill read the text of the amendment to the amendment.)

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment to the amendment. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is very evident. I do not believe that the Executive Committee or the Council expects in any way to impair the action of our rules committees. I believe we have 14 rules committees. The rules committees are not responsible to anyone in any way. This legislation merely means that if a rules committee passes a change of a rule after this date that this amendment is effective, it can be reviewed by the Executive Committee if that Committee deems that there are substantive changes from financial or administrative points of view.

That would be done only after consultation with the rules committee involved. I do not expect that the Executive Committee will exercise this procedure very often, but I do believe it is better on many occasions to lock the barn door before the horse gets out of the barn.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I rise to speak in opposition. I am a teaching representative of my institution. I have served for 15 years as Secretary of the Basketball Rules Committee without vote. I mention that because I think I can speak objectively on this proposal. This committee, Mr. President, represents 400 years of basketball experience, great knowledge of able men in the sport of basketball, with outstanding leadership on the part of its past chairmen and its present chairman. The service rendered the NCAA by this dedicated group represents a labor of love and a desire to serve the best interest of collegiate basketball and NCAA membership.

With all due respect to the Executive Committee, I question seriously the potential ability of the Executive Committee to become expert in the playing rules of all the sports, the 14 of them that come under this legislation. I question, incidentally, the right or the intent here, because it limits what I believe to be the real intent. I feel, Mr. President, if there is a problem being posed on the specific rules committee, I suggest it can be handled differently, and therefore speak in opposition to the process and authority advocated in this proposition.

[Amendment C (page A-9) was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Hill: In answer to Mr. Steitz I do not believe the Executive Committee feels that it is an authority on the rules of play. This legislation does not affect the rules of play passed by the rules committee unless that rule of play seriously affects the administration or the financial aspects of the operation of that rules committee. The normal rules of play are not involved whatever with this.

J. William Orwig (Indiana University): Mr. President, it seems to me this amendment takes the autonomy away from the rules committee and places it in the hands of the Executive Committee. Many of the rules committees are made up of individuals who have long been in the service of the particular sport. They are extremely knowledgeable of that particular sport.

Having served on one rules committee and still serving on one, I know this particular committee would not pass any rule detrimental or injurious to the sport or opposed to the organization of the sport. Therefore, I would feel if such legislation is passed there would be no need for having rules committees in the future, and so I ask that you vote against this amendment.

Francis E. Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): A point has been missed in the previous discussion, and that is that the Executive Committee's review is subject to appeal to the Council, and as has been suggested in the past on occasion where the rules are reviewed, this is just for the future. There might be an occasion in the future where the rule should be reviewed and we need the machinery to do it.

I would like to emphasize what Jesse has already said; that this legislation will apply only to rules which affect the administration or financial aspect. It would not affect the playing rules.

Mr. Orwig: There is machinery in operation to review the rules within the rules committees themselves. Those of you who have served on various rules committees know that rules have been passed, put

into operation and tried. They come before the rules committee again and are reviewed and rescinded. So the machinery is set up for that particular purpose.

John Waldorf (Big Eight Conference): I am chairman of the Football Rules Committee and I rise to object to this amendment.

For years my association with the NCAA has led me to believe the real strength of the group is through the committee system. Men have been selected I believe through the years in the NCAA on the basis of ability and knowledge.

Now, all committees, whether they be rules committees or any other committees, are placed in the position where a rule change may be reviewed. We come to the position where the playing conditions of the game are changed and we have vital rules which have to be passed. They can be reviewed, and during the review we have nothing to cover that particular situation on the playing field.

Gentlemen, we would be in error to pass this without a little more study and possibly a liaison in some way between the rules committee and the Executive Committee.

Mr. Steitz: I would like to speak in support of the points my colleague just made. The Basketball Rules Committee has on occasion when legislation was passed, not from the cost standpoint alone but sometimes we did recognize the cost, convened again at the request of various groups. That has been in effect, and I suggest that if it is the desire of the Council and the Executive Committee to review and to stop there, I know that the dedicated people on these committees who give much of their lives to rules, will listen attentively, and review their actions. They are not adamant men who are power hungry for authority in rules, but they are a group of dedicated people who act for the best interest of basketball, in my particular sport, and basketball has fared well. They are dedicated to the proposition of doing what is best for the institutions and the NCAA.

I don't think we need the veto power of the Executive Committee at all in any sport, Mr. Chairman.

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, I, too, speak, I suppose, in behalf of the Executive Committee and Council. The speakers here have been speaking as interested parties, either representing the interests of the Executive Committee or representing the interests of the rules committees. Mr. President, I suggest that the speakers should first recognize that there must be some line of responsibility, that there is an ultimate responsibility. This is a constitutional organization, which affects the line of responsibility and it is not composed of bodies acting independently.

John W. Winkin (Colby College): I am a member of the Baseball Rules Committee and I support the opposition to this Amendment.

Mr. Orwig: I take no objection personally to Amendment No. 19 relative to any rules of play being reviewed by the Executive Committee. I do take objection, however, which is very evident, to authorizing and giving authority to the Executive Committee to veto such a rule. I don't think there would be a great deal of objection on the part of any of the rules committees to having any rules reviewed by the Executive Committee and referred back perhaps to the particular rules committee for further review, but I don't believe the Executive Committee should have the authority to revoke or suspend any particular rule in any one of the games played.

William L. Matthews (University of Kentucky): The words of the amendment are: "If the Executive Committee determines that the rule is not appropriate for financial or administrative reasons." It would help me if it were possible to give an example of a particular rule of play which the Executive Committee might determine was not appropriate for financial or administrative reasons.

Mr. Hill: It is possible that a rules committee could make it illegal to use certain types of materials in manufacturing equipment. There is a possibility of a rule to have at the present time fan-shaped or rectangular backboards in basketball.

The Executive Committee and the Council are not interested in the normal playing rules. We are interested only in a situation that would affect the financial situation of the institutions and the Association.

I do feel that the Executive Committee has considerable experience from the financial point of view and the budget and those are important matters in this Association. If this need does arise, it is done after consultation with the rules committee—after consultation. Then the rules committee can still appeal to the Council, so you do have protection there.

Forest Evashevski (University of Iowa): We have the Executive Committee reviewing the rules, the Council and another group, and then of course it comes back to the Convention floor, at which time I am assuming every rule can be reviewed on the floor of the Convention. In the 29 years I have been a member of this organization the NCAA has always reviewed the rules.

Mr. Hill: This amendment does not give the authority to the Executive Committee to go back and review present rules. This affects only changes of the rules that become effective after this date. So it does not mean that all of the rules of all of the committees are going to be reviewed—only changes in the rules after this takes effect.

Mr. Evashevski: May I say on the issue that we are to act on what happens from today on. There are some rules that have been changed by one word, and I would object to a review by the Executive Committee. The rule will still apply and I strongly oppose it.

[Amendment No. 19, as amended, was defeated, 84 to 214.]

President Cross: You might be interested in knowing that there are 712 persons registered. There are 430 persons who are voting delegates, 206 alternates and 76 others registered. Both the 430 and 712 are record attendances.

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, it is my pleasure to present a matter at this time which I trust is completely noncontroversial and which I hope will receive unanimous support. I refer to Amendments No. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25. (pages A-9 through A-12) These items are all related. They all have to do with amending Article 3, Section 2, in very minor ways. They are all simply housekeeping changes that are suggested.

Mr. President, I move that these six amendments be adopted and considered together. [The motion was seconded.]

President Cross: This is, of course, out of order, and the Convention has the right to divide the question and act on each amendment individually. Is there a request to divide? Hearing none, the motion before us is the adoption of these several that I have just mentioned.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, these are housekeeping proposals. They

have to do primarily with setting up a secretary-rules editor in these committees and providing for his selection. There is a variety of committees so these have to be created separately and the amendments appear separately, but I see nothing objectionable to any of them. I hope you don't even ask me any questions about them, because I don't know much about them. [Laughter]

President Cross: That is one person who is completely honest. [Laughter]

[Amendments No. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 were approved by voice vote.]

We are now to Amendment No. 26 and you will be happy to know that Jesse Hill has another chance. [Laughter]

Mr. Hill: Mr. President and Gentlemen: Amendment No. 26 (page A-12) to Section 2 of Article 3 and Section 2 of Article 5 establishes a Water Polo Rules and Tournament Committee with the intent that that committee would have the administration of the Championship and the formulation of rules. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. President and Delegates: Amendment No. 27 (page A-13) would reduce the terms of the members, thereby giving more people an opportunity to serve on the College Basketball Committee.

In view of a recommendation from the Committee on Committees, I move that this amendment be referred to a committee to be appointed by the Council to study the terms of standing committees.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

President Cross: The effect of this motion, if adopted, would be to direct the Council to set up such a committee. That is an item on the agenda for the Council in April in response, as Mr. Koenig has told you, to a recommendation from the Committee on Committees that the committee subject needs to be studied.

Freshman Rule

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President and Delegates, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 28 (page A-13) to Article 4, Sections 1 and 2, which adds in the appropriate places "and ice hockey." [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, the intent of this amendment is to put ice hockey in the same category as football and basketball, and not to allow freshmen to play on the varsity team.

This is a controversial question, I realize, and apologize that there are only 76 schools in the country listed as having ice hockey teams and therefore the majority of our membership has little or no interest in this amendment. I have been trying to explain to a friend of mine in the Southwest how ice hockey fits into his schedule and have been unsuccessful. I hope I will be more successful in explanation of this amendment.

There are two points I would like to bring up. At the present time in the East, freshmen are not eligible in ice hockey as well as in basketball and football. We know nationally that freshmen are eligible in hockey. This creates an inequality at the National Championship because the Eastern teams do not use freshmen, although they could. It is difficult to bench a boy who is brought to a national championship,

and the Western teams do use freshmen. During the year this same inequality exists. Our school has played four Western teams this year. We did not use freshmen, and they did.

That is the point, to put this on an equal basis, especially in the National Championship.

Secondly, there is a great Canadian influence in the game of ice hockey. According to the NCAA Committee on Ice Hockey, 450 Canadians were playing in the U. S. in 1968 and 1969, and every indication is that number has increased. In the East, among the 15 teams in Division I, two out of every three hockey players are Canadians.

This legislation is not intended in any way to discriminate against the Canadian hockey player. I don't believe I would be in favor of such legislation. However, some people feel that the American boy is being discriminated against and is not getting an opportunity to play. American boys would get more opportunities if we adopted this amendment. Many schools recruit four, five or six Canadians a year. If you recruit six Canadians a year, the American boy does not have much of a chance, especially if you do not have a freshman team. However, if you do have the freshman rule at least the American boy will have the opportunity in his first year to prove that he can compete. It is true that the Canadian boy is more mature than the American boy because his competition in high school year is different than ours. He plays more games, his periods are longer, and therefore, when he comes as a freshman he is farther advanced than most American hockey players.

Therefore, for these two reasons, I would like this amendment approved.

The NCAA Ice Hockey Committee approved unanimously that freshmen not be allowed to play on the varsity level.

Also, a survey conducted by the Collegiate Hockey Association resulted in the following: There are 76 hockey playing colleges in the United States, and of those voting on allowing freshmen to play on the varsity, 38 voted against freshman participation; 17 voted to allow them to play, and three were undecided.

Leonard R. Marti (University of North Dakota): At the present time there is a committee of the NCAA working on a number of problems related to hockey, and I feel strongly that we should consider the overall item for study. For that reason I move that this amendment be tabled.

[The motion was seconded and approved, 113-109.]

[Note: A motion to reconsider the motion to table was also defeated. See page 106.]

Transfer Rule

Kenneth H. McFall (Bowling Green State University): Mr. President, I move we amend Article 4, Section 1-(d) as indicated in Amendment No. 29 (pages A-14 and A-15). [The motion was seconded.]

The Special NCAA Committee on Junior College Relations believes this amendment will prevent a non-predictor from transferring to another institution after attending one year. A non-predictor would be required to graduate from a junior college, or present 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credits.

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Is a non-predictor one who has taken the test but has gone below the acceptable minimum, and also one who has not taken the test at all?

Mr. McFall: Frankly, I don't know the answer to that question. A person has to take the test to be a predictor. That is my personal opinion. If he didn't take the test he wouldn't be a predictor.

President Cross: I think the answer is to the contrary. The intent is that a student whose prediction has not been established shall be required to take the test on the first national test date. So the experience of that would indicate that only the one who has taken the test and does not predict falls into this language. It is obviously not official, but I think that is inherent in the legislation and the interpretation that we have now.

[Amendment No. 29 (pages A-14 and A-15) was approved by voice vote.]

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. President and Delegates: I move the adoption of the Amendment No. 30 (pages A-15 and A-16) to Article 4 of the Bylaws. [The motion was seconded.]

The effect of this amendment will be to permit students who have been disqualified academically at one institution to be eligible for NCAA events after one year of residence following transfer to NCAA member institution.

Lysle Butler (Oberlin College): Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I recommend, however, that the Council consider in the near future dropping the remaining part of the legislation. It makes no sense to me that we require a boy to be ineligible for two years after a transfer to an institution when he has been accepted by the institution. Certainly one year is long enough, even in a disciplinary case, to decide whether the boy is worthy of participation in all the activities of the institution.

I would like to raise a procedural question, Mr. Chairman. Is it possible to have a registered vote of abstention recorded? If such is possible, I would like to be able to vote as abstaining.

President Cross: The answer is "No," because it has no parliamentary significance. Present and voting are the ones which are parliamentarily determined. The abstainers have no part of parliamentary significance. So I will rule we will not recognize abstention.

Mr. Butler: There are some amendments presented here which I do not support because of the manner in which they are presented. I opposed this regulation when it was passed in 1962. To vote in favor of the new amendment without the elimination of the other part does not give me the opportunity to protest the original action. I would like to have the privilege purely for that reason to abstain. However, I bow to your ruling.

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): It seems to me that the amendment would mean that a student must complete two years of residence after registration. The intent is to permit the student to be eligible for events after one year. I wonder if there is a mistake.

Mr. Koenig: We are deleting the word "academic." By deleting the word "academic" we are saying anyone who transfers for academic reasons will be eligible after one year.

[Amendment No. 30 (pages A-15 and A-16) was approved by voice vote.]

Competitive Designation

Dwight T. Reed (Lincoln University—Missouri): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: Amendment No. 31 (page A-16) amends Article 4, Section 6.

I move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the amendment is obvious; to establish a notification date for institutions desiring to change their classification from University to College Division.

[Amendment No. 31 was approved by voice vote.]

1.600 Rule

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 32 (page A-16) to Article 4, Section 6-(b). [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President and Members of the Association, the intent of this amendment proposed by the Council is to clarify the 1.600 legislation as it applies to institutional eligibility. If you have read Article 4, Section 6-(b), you will discover the rule only applies to students first entering a collegiate institution. It does not apply to transfer students. The purpose of this legislation is to require that a transfer student meet the same requirements.

If a student transfers from Institution A to Institution B, he must have a 1.600 grade average at Institution A.

There is an exception for the junior college student. We are placing the same requirement in this legislation as in Amendment No. 29. In other words, the junior college non-predictor has to be either a graduate or have been two years at a junior college and complete 48 semesters or 72 quarter hours.

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): This is perhaps a small point, but frequently in looking over legislation after it has been passed by the Association there is a certain lack of clarity. In this case this very long sentence which has no punctuation in it whatsoever could be interpreted to read that even if he is a graduate of a junior college he must have spent a minimum of two years there. The way it is stated in Amendment No. 29 it is pretty clear these are options; that he is to be a graduate, or has the combination of 48 semester hours and two years of residence.

To make it quite clear, I would suggest an editorial change at the end of line 8, where it says "must be a graduate of the junior college" that there be a comma, which would indicate that one condition, and the rest of the sentence combines the two—48 semester hours and two years.

President Cross: If there is no objection from the Convention, that editorial change will be made. It is so ordered. [Amendment No. 32 was approved by voice vote.]

NCAA Athletic Events

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 33 to the Bylaws, Article 5, Section 1-(a) and Article 5, Section 2-(h).

This is to establish the National Collegiate Lacrosse Championship and provide for its administration, effective in the fall.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting

Edwin H. Cady (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 34 (page A-17) to Article 6, Section 5, of the Bylaws. [The motion was seconded.]

As you know, there has been a Special Committee on Recruiting at work for some time. In response to a rather urgent feeling on the part of the high school people around the country, we attempted to regularize the activities of recruiters with regard to visits made by prospective student-athletes to the campuses and visits of recruiters to the homes of prospective student-athletes.

This particular proposal has the obvious purpose of limiting the visits of the prospective student-athlete to the campus. You might find it a little more enlightening if you consider it in terms of Proposed Interpretation No. 9 (page A-25). You can see what the total result of these by way of limitation.

[Amendment No. 34 was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 35 (pages A-17 and A-18) to Article 6 of the Bylaws. [The motion was seconded.]

It is obvious that Amendment No. 35 continues the attempt to order and limit entertainment and reduce the expense of visits by prospective student-athletes to the campus.

[Amendment No. 35 was approved by voice vote.]

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Mr. President, I refer to the continuation of the proposals made by the Committee on Recruiting. As Ed Cady explained to you, it does restrict the representatives of athletic interests in visiting the prospect in his home to two visits.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 36 (page A-18). [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Cady: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Amendment D (pages A-18 and A-19) adding the following: "and except that the limitation of this paragraph shall not apply to the athletic staff or representatives of the athletic interests of an institution to which the prospective student-athlete has indicated his acceptance of its grant of financial aid by his signature of a formal statement of intent or tender issued by the institution." [The motion was seconded.]

The only sensible thing for me to do at this point is to say the Committee on Recruiting suffered from a certain failure of the imagination in thinking through what it was doing. This is a very complicated organization and there are a great many different kinds of institutions. As chairman of the committee, I accept full responsibility. I am perfectly willing to say I blew it.

Our failure of imagination worked in the following way: Those of us who are accustomed to handling recruiting matters this way are also accustomed to say it is a matter of common sense and good practice that when a recruit has signified his intention to attend a given institution he is no longer regarded as a recruit. We have taken it for granted that the chosen institution is free to make contact with the prospective student at that point without limitation.

It seemed to us and it seemed to me that in order to make this clear in Amendment No. 36 we very much needed Amendment D.

Lysle Butler (Oberlin College): Mr. Cady, is this the first place in any of our legislation that the letter of intent or tender appears?

Mr. Cady: I am very sorry to say, Mr. Butler, I cannot honestly answer that question. I don't know.

Mr. Butler: As nearly as I can recall, there is no other point at which it does appear. I think it is a mistake to include this in legislation. I am in opposition to a letter of intent or tender for those small schools that do not use the device.

Mr. Cady: Thank you very much. It is called to my attention that O.I. 2-(c)-(2) reads "fraudulently misrepresents any information on his application, letter-of-intent or tender." So the introduction of this language is not a novelty in our rules. I can only say that I am doing my best not to be back-handed.

William Lakie (University of California, Davis): I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment because there are many College Division schools that do not offer scholarship aid or use letters-of-intent. We do not have any letter-of-intent and do not offer scholarship aid. This is a liberalization extended to schools using the letter-of-intent or scholarship aid.

Mr. Cady: I don't see how the situation would be changed under this amendment in the circumstance you have stated. Let us say you are anxious to recruit a scholar who has already signed the national letter-of-intent. I can think of no better restriction on your doing so.

Glenn J. Drahn (Coe College): I think if this legislation passes, however, the institution which does not give athletic scholarships would be declared ineligible for NCAA competition, if this is a national letter-of-intent.

President Cross: I don't see any possible way that would result.

Mr. Lakie: I will refer to a student assigned to the University of California, Berkeley. Berkeley uses the letter-of-intent; Davis does not. At this point Berkeley can contact the youngster numerous times during the summer, whereas we cannot. This is a liberalization for the school that utilizes the letter-of-intent.

President Cross: Mr. Cady pointed out that there is not any NCAA rule that prevents Berkeley from trying to keep its prospect away from Davis.

John Kane (University of Arkansas): I have mixed feelings about this amendment. I haven't had a chance to discuss it to any extent. I have reservations about the original amendment, too, and I don't know whether this amendment to the amendment helps or hurts.

I see one difficulty somewhat in line with the difficulty that has been suggested. Some conferences utilize a letter-of-intent and they have specified, as many know, the earliest date on which it may be signed. Now, in the case of a conference which has a signing date of February 15 in competition with the conference that has a signing date of December 5; after December 5 the second conference's institutions can make several visits whereas the other conference cannot. I know the rebuttal might be: Why doesn't the conference with the signing date of February 15 change it? It might be forced on the conference, but I don't know whether the conference would want to do this or not.

As I say, I am against the amendment in its entirety, and may have more to say on it later, but with respect to the amendment to the amendment, I am not sure whether it helps or hurts.

Mr. Cady: I think I can say to the gentleman from Arkansas, as far as the amendment to the amendment is concerned, he and I appear to be in complete agreement. It is precisely freedom for the institution with the early signing date.

Howard H. Hoogesteger (Lake Forest College): If my institution sends its representatives to a lad two times and the boy signs the letter-of-intent on December 15 for my institution; then another institution comes in and attempts to change his mind, my institution should have the right for a rebuttal of anything that comes up after that.

J. William Orwig (Indiana University): In reply to the gentleman who said they do not use the letter-of-intent, I refer to Constitution 3-4-(c), which requires that: "In all cases, the institutional agency making the award of aid shall give the recipient a written statement of the amount, duration, conditions and terms thereof."

This statement, regardless of whether or not he signs the national letter-of-intent, clarifies it.

[Amendment D (pages A-18 and A-19) was approved, 144 to 131.]

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): Does this amendment mean that a college which does not offer an athletic scholarship and does not have a letter-of-intent, is almost required to have an institutional letter-of-intent to defend itself?

Mr. Chapman: That would appear wise. [Laughter]

Mr. Butler: Mr. President, this requires more consideration than we are giving it if your interpretation of the necessity for a letter-of-intent is true. I don't read that in this motion, even as amended, and I would challenge that, because I am certain there are many members of this organization who are not going to pay any attention to a letter-of-intent if a boy signs it at another institution. We don't have legislation to compel it and your interpretation which seems to be implicit is in error.

Mr. Chapman: Our interpretation was not that the rule would require you to have a letter-of-intent, but in recruiting competition this amendment would move people in that direction.

Eddie Crowder (University of Colorado): I would like to speak concerning the proposed amendment from the standpoint of a coach, which I am, as well as athletic director.

The motivation for this proposed amendment is economic. I would like to clarify whether or not this in fact serves a good economic purpose.

This amendment allows only two visits prior to the signing date. In so doing it suggests also that you may have alumni or interested friends continue your recruiting.

From past experience, when this type of rule has existed in various parts of the country, two things have occurred when alumni are brought into recruiting.

No. 1. It does not minimize the expense. Coaches do in fact go to a hotel, organize the alumni, organize the recruitment, implement the recruitment, send them to see the young man and thereby spend very nearly as much and perhaps more money than would have been expended had they not been restricted in this way.

The second point I think is most valid. It is highly undesirable to introduce a wide number of other people into recruitment. We have found that as soon as you introduce alumni and interested friends en masse, which certainly would be possible with this amendment, you have far less control.

The university or college does have a responsibility in recruitment and thereby refrains from doing things which are not considered legal or ethical. Those restraints are totally voided if you enter into recruitment with other people.

We find there are a few universities in the United States which have enjoyed such long-time athletic proficiency that recruitment to them is not necessary. We find many outstanding athletes are recruited by these universities without any visit to the home. We find that some of us who are not fortunate enough to have that long-time reputation, try to

equalize our opportunity simply by recruiting. If we, under the guise of economy, are restricted in recruiting we sacrifice that opportunity, and we will have given up some of the good life in the hope of establishing economy which, in fact, we will not get.

Mr. Cady: Let me say, first of all, as an English professor what I know about recruiting I have learned from coaches and ex-coaches. Everybody on the Recruiting Committee except me was an active coach or one who has recently been active. One was the commissioner of a conference. There were a few directors of athletics. I don't believe you can say the committee did not consider the coaches.

I should say, first of all, that the economic motive for this particular amendment was a secondary one. There was an economic motive. We hoped to cut down the competitive demands upon the athletic budget for visit after visit, "keeping up with the Joneses."

But our primary motive was the reduction of harassment. Everybody has seen repeatedly in the newspapers the story of 27 coaches sitting forlornly on the front porch rail, awaiting their turn to get in to grill the prospect. There is often a good deal of sympathy extended to the coaches, but my sympathy has always been for the poor people inside who had to endure 28 hostile invasions.

It is the hustle, it is the competitiveness, it is the firing of competitive technique after technique on the young man, his family, his community, to the detriment of the good name of collegiate athletics, which we hope to be able to reduce.

A. A. White (University of Houston): This amendment would not change the competitiveness, it would just change the action. Instead of the coach being there the third time it would be the alumni.

There is some terminology in this proposal that troubles me. For example, the home community or the contiguous community. Certainly you have to interpret what is the home community before you interpret what the contiguous community is, and I am not sure what the home community would be.

In New York, I don't know whether it includes all five boroughs or whether it includes one borough, the one in which he lives. In Houston, for example, I don't know whether it includes Houston, Bellaire, Pasadena, Spring Branch or San Jacinto. In Fort Worth, a number of schools are trying to combine in one community. In a consolidated school district extending over a wide territory where is a student's home community—the entire consolidated community or his church and home community? The terminology should be made clear.

John Kane (University of Arkansas): The Southwest Conference did have a visit limitation rule for many years. It was, as I recall, a two-visit limitation. It is fair to say, although someone from the Conference might disagree, that this worked fairly well for a number of years. But it is also fair to say that there were a number of informal and sometimes formal agreements of the coaches on interpretations over a considerable period of time, and policing of each other. As it seemed essentially to work less well, the Southwest Conference abandoned this a year ago. Actually the coaches in the Conference, as I recall, voted eight to nothing to recommend that we not go back to the visit and limitation rule.

The difficulties were somewhat along the lines I have already described. There are such problems as: What constitutes a visit? How long is a visit? Does it extend for a week or two weeks?

More troublesome perhaps, was what our coaches began to call "bumping." That is the accidental bumping into a prospect; you can't help it. It is accidental in many cases. There were a great many difficulties in the implementation of this rule.

I certainly share the view of Mr. Cady on the problem of harassment, but I have great doubt as to whether at the national level, without very, very careful consideration of some of these problems, this thing could be administered in a reasonable way that would be fair, that would bring about any real degree of conformity.

Likewise, I agree with Mr. Crowder that we would just be turning recruitment over to the alumni, which I think would be a step backward as well.

President Cross: I would like to comment on the home community and the contiguous community. Of course, we all know this is a matter of difficulty, but it has been a matter of our legislation in O.I. 154, which we have entertained for a long time, and there are some ground rules about it.

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, I am responding to Mr. Cady's comment that the primary motive considered was the reduction of harassment. It says to limit the number of off-campus visits to two.

In view of Mr. Cady's comments and in view of the intent, it seems to me that Amendment D which was passed reduces the effectiveness of this particular amendment to the point where it is almost worthless. For example, as I understand it—my particular institution is not involved so I can be direct—there are a number of conferences which now have letters-of-intent. According to Amendment D, if a conference has a signing date of December 6, its member can go back as often as it wishes. Members of a conference with a signing date in January can go back as often as they want. If Conference C has a signing date in February, its members can go back as often as they want. If they use the interconference letter-of-intent they can go back as often as they want after May 6.

In view of this, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the delegates understood the primary motive which we now learn from Mr. Cady. In view of that, I move that we reconsider the amendment to the amendment.

Delegate: Unless he voted for the amendment he cannot move to reconsider.

President Cross: It is not necessary to be certain who voted for or against. As a matter of parliamentary rule, anyone can make a motion to reconsider, and I so rule. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Cady: A great deal depends on the will of the NCAA to deal with this pressing, and in some cases scandalous, problem. What I have heard from many of the respondents this morning is what the philosopher once called strategic obscuration. Instead of facing the issue and taking in hand the problem which is embarrassing, sometimes scandalous, sometimes demoralizing to our staffs; and trying to improve the entire position of collegiate athletics in our national community, we have been faced with a series of efforts to make nonsense out of what is certainly not perfect and cannot be made perfect.

The question is whether the Convention has any will to try to solve the problems of the Association.

Robert Johnson (College of William and Mary): I came to this Con-

vention prepared to vote for Amendment No. 36. Now, with the amendment to the amendment, I am not at all prepared to vote, for this reason: It is my understanding—I had no way of finding out actually until after the vote on the amendment—that if a school does not have a conference letter-of-intent it would be able to institute an institutional letter-of-intent. I understand there is no reason the institution could not do this in the sophomore year in high school, because it is specifically tied to that, and they could recruit forever.

The amendment to the amendment has taken away what I thought was a very good amendment, which the committee intended and for which I was prepared to vote. The amendment to the amendment has destroyed the intent and the value of the amendment.

[The motion to reconsider Amendment D to Amendment No. 36 was approved, 169 to 81.]

[The Convention then recessed at 12:10 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Afternoon, January 14, 1970

The meeting convened at 1:30 p.m., President Cross presiding.

President Cross: What is now before us is motion on Amendment D (pages A-18 and A-19). What we are asking is whether we will now amend Amendment No. 36. We are not on the proposed Amendment No. 36 (page 18).

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): It is a question of whether this Association wants to meet this problem of recruiting straight on or not. If we don't want the amendment to the amendment, we can leave it unamended, and I so recommend.

Robert Johnson (College of William and Mary): From the discussion, I have been led to the conclusion that we will actually not have a two-visit rule with this amendment to the amendment because schools will adopt their own institutional letter-of-intent. The effect of the amendment to the amendment will be to do away with the original amendment.

[Amendment D (pages A-18 and A-19) was defeated, 65 to 184.]

President Cross: We now have before us Amendment No. 36 (page A-18).

Mr. Cady: Mr. President, my plea is that you give this back to the Committee on Recruiting and let us have a chance to work on it again. I urge this partly because I have a feeling of conscience about it; that it was written without the committee having really thought it through. Some of the institutions who are most nearly concerned with the kind of problem to which the amendment addresses itself, are going to find themselves severely penalized. I shall be unhappy about this for their sake. I shall be unhappy about it simply because the Committee did a bad job.

I am urging you to vote against Amendment No. 36.

President Cross: As I understand Mr. Cady's point, he is saying that this did not come to the attention of the Committee on Recruiting in time to think the thing through, and he feels as an institutional representative that the inability of the Convention to agree with him has forced him now to wish that the Committee may study the problem and make some recommendation; either the original one, or in some fashion that it can be presented and made more understandable.

Abe Martin (Texas Christian University): I want to talk about this two-visit rule for a moment. We had the two-visit rule in our conference for a number of years.

I don't believe we can administer a two-visit rule nationally. We had some problems conferencewise dealing with "bumps" and that kind of thing.

About a year ago we quit the two-visit rule and we just visit as we wish. I believe our meeting this year was the most harmonious that our conference ever had. I don't really believe that with not seeing youngsters while they are playing high school football and the sign-up time, that we need this two-visit rule at all.

Roy L. Whistler (Purdue University): I move that this amendment be referred to the Recruiting Committee for reconsideration. Any body of this size with the diversity of opinion illustrated this morning does not see all the aspects of the proposition that is before us. It would be to our advantage to have this referred to the Committee for reconsideration and brought back to the Council at its next meeting. [The motion was seconded.]

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Amendment No. 36 is one that came to the Council from the Recruiting Committee. We have had it a number of months. We have had a chance to look at it.

I suggest, Mr. President, that we adopt this amendment. We agree it is not perfect, and it may be subject to some change in the future. We may want to revise it to a certain extent, but I am willing to say this will be to the benefit of the student himself. If we come back next year with another amendment perhaps we will have the same type of problem.

So, Mr. President, I urge that we adopt this amendment rather than postpone, reconsider or resubmit.

Albert W. Twitchell (Rutgers University): I don't want to vote down any of these proposals, but there is a clarification necessary for a few of us at least. It may be understood by most, but during the recess there were several of us who did not agree on the interpretation of the first part of the first sentence, which says, "No member of an athletic staff or other representative of an institution's athletic interests . . ."

As a result of the general ruling this morning, you stated the coach is allowed two visits and then the alumni can make as many visits as they want. We are wondering if that is a fact, because it says, "No member of an athletic staff or other representative of an institution's athletic interests may visit a prospective student-athlete . . ." I interpret that to include the alumni representing the institution. In other words, it is two visits among the coach and the alumni, representing the university.

Secondly, what constitutes a representative of an institution's athletic interests? Does it, for example, include the admissions officer who also in his processing talk to that boy who comes to that institution because of the athletic program?

President Cross: You will find the answer to the second question in O.I. 120. That phraseology is old. We have had it for a substantial period of time, and while it has some awkwardness, I don't think there is anything new in the concept. That has been in front of us for some time, whether or not it has ever been before the Infractions Committee.

As to your first question, you can get a yes or no answer, depending on the alumnus or friend of the institution continuing to recruit after the coaches had had their two visits. The exception is where the answer lies: "except that a representative . . . who lives in the prospect's home community or a contiguous community shall not be restricted to the two-visit limitation."

There is the problem, for instance, of a neighbor who hopes the boy will attend the institution urging him in part to attend for athletic reasons and not just out of loyalty to his alma mater. He could very well be a representative of the athletic interests, but you are making a neighborly visit illegal, and that perhaps goes beyond reason. I suppose exempting the home community or contiguous community is an at-

tempt to narrow the likelihood of the abuse of the spirit of the two-visit rule through practical necessity.

[The motion to refer Amendment No. 36 to the Special Committee on Recruiting was approved, 186 to 101.]

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): I came up here three hours and forty minutes ago to introduce No. 36. I hope this won't take as long. [Laughter]

Amendment No. 37 (page A-19) is in support of the amendment offered on behalf of the Recruiting Committee. The main impulse of this amendment is to eliminate contacting student-athletes at the site of competition in which they are engaged.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 37.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Extra Events

James H. Decker (Syracuse University): On behalf of the Extra Events Committee and the Council, I move to amend Article 7A, Section 1-(j) as shown in Amendment No. 38. The time element in this article would then read: "6:00 p.m. (local time at the site at which the institution's football team is competing) of the Saturday prior to the institution's last game of the third Saturday in November." [The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to create a more realistic relationship between the bowl selection committee and the schools under consideration.

[Amendment No. 38 was approved by voice vote.]

President Cross: Amendments No. 39 and No. 40 (pages A-19 and A-20) do not reduce the information required, but permit a notarized statement. Some meets should not spend the money for formal audit in the view of the Extra Events Committee and the Council. We are trying to minimize what could well be an unwarranted expense.

[The motions were regularly made, seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Freshman Rule

Herbert W. Gallagher (Northeastern University): Mr. President, I appreciate we are in a democratic society and every member institution and conference is entitled to the privilege of voting. However, as a member institution sponsoring the sport of ice hockey, I urge those of you who are not planning to sponsor it immediately or who are not concerned with it to allow those of us who do sponsor it to have a chance to administer this sport as we think best.

I move that Amendment No. 28 (pages A-13 and A-14) be removed from the table. [The motion was seconded and defeated, 116 to 132.]

Playing and Practice Seasons

Wiles Hallock (Western Athletic Conference): Mr. President and Gentlemen: I move to amend Article 8, Section 1-(a), third paragraph, as shown in Amendment No. 41 (page A-20) to permit the total number of contests in football to be raised from 10 to 11. [The motion was seconded.]

Although the sponsors of this amendment are the Pacific-8 Conference, the Atlantic Coast Conference and the Western Athletic Conference, all the members of these conferences are not in favor of the amendment or the desirability of playing 11 games, but I believe the most important point is that it is permissive rather than mandatory.

You may play 11 games. You certainly need not play 11 if you don't wish to.

The 11th game has the potential for increased revenue at a time when the prospect for our programs is so very critical. It is obvious for some institutions this would definitely be true. Also, for some other institutions it might not be true. Again, you may play 11, but you may not wish to.

I don't believe there is any really valid academic argument against it, in respect to taking more time from the classroom.

The permission to play 11 games will open up intersectional opportunities for institutions which is very desirable, and which do not now exist because of the locked-in scheduling process. The scheduling process will be comparably free for the benefit of any institution.

Many colleges are starting earlier which will permit earlier scheduling of games than is now the case. Many feel that where there is early scheduling it has led to open dates in midseason, and increasing the number of games is much better than an open date and certainly does not require any additional practice time.

In answer to the argument that this would be too great a burden on players and coaches, I would point out that about a fifth of the major college teams are annually playing their 11th game in bowl competition.

Again, this amendment does not require that you play 11 games if it is not in your best interest. [Amendment No. 41 was approved, 162 to 98.]

9. REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

Institutional Aid

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, pursuant to the policy of the Council, the official interpretations of the past year are brought before this Association for approval.

I move the adoption of Proposed Interpretation No. 1 (page A-21) which amends O.I. 2. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment E (page A-21) to Proposed Interpretation No. 1. [The motion was seconded.]

I have been associated with O.I. 2 for the past two years. This year, I have the privilege of supporting on behalf of the Council an amendment that benefits the students. There have been abuses in the past of students not knowing whether or not they were going to receive a grant-in-aid when they came back to their institution in the fall. It is the purpose of this amendment to require each institution that is going to renew or terminate a grant-in-aid, as allowed under our rules, to give notice of a decision on or before July 1. Then they are to notify that individual promptly of the decision to grant aid or terminate.

This allows the student at least to plan for the year while knowing whether he is to receive aid or he is going to have to go to school without aid.

If an institution on July 1 tells the student-athlete, "Your grant has been terminated," this amendment does not mean they cannot come back at the beginning of the school and say, "We have found new money; we can give you a new grant now." So it does offer the student-athlete some protection, and for that reason it is an appropriate amendment.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): As I read the amendment to the amendment, it is contradictory. According to the

original revision, in the second sentence, "The renewal of a scholarship or grant-in-aid award shall be made on or before July 1 prior to the academic year it is to be effective."

You cannot make an award to a student who is not eligible. However, a student cannot be eligible for competition until he has been admitted, otherwise he is not an active student.

For this reason I think these two sentences are contradictory.

Secondly, on the proposal to revise O.I. 2, you may recall that a similar amendment was offered last year. That proposal was defeated by a vote of 9 to 196. I am not aware of any fundamental changes that have taken place since that time.

I am also puzzled and troubled by the word "scholarship."

Finally, the difficulty with this is that it puts the institution in a very severe position with respect to the student. Our experience is quite contrary to the one the previous speaker mentioned. We find in our institution the student who has a grant-in-aid may suddenly decide, "I don't want to compete; I have a whole year, why should I compete?" Or for some other reason he decides not to compete. This is a distinct disadvantage.

Gentlemen, the amendment to the proposal plus the original proposal have too many bugs in them. It is unfair to the institution.

Mr. Swank: The major argument of Mr. Schultze is that there is some unfairness to an institution. I believe in this amendment we must have a certain amount of fairness for our student-athletes. It is rather improper to ask a young man to come back if he thinks the financial arrangements have been made to take care of his board and room; then the university decides not to give him aid.

I do not believe this legislation would be an undue burden upon the institution. July 1 is approximately two months before the school term begins. The institution should be able to make the decision as to whether or not a young man should have aid.

Yes, there may be times the young man comes to practice and says, "No, I don't want to participate any longer." This is the exception, and in order to do the greatest good for the student-athlete we should adopt this amendment.

Mr. Schultze: Mr. Chairman, in many institutions, including ours, it is technically impossible to have the information by July 1, because the graduation of students does not take place until June 15 or 16, and the examinations last until about that time.

President Cross: The answer to the last point made by Professor Schultze is that the notification can include the condition of eligibility without in any sense violating the spirit of the proposal. Undoubtedly in some institutions that would have to be done for the very reason Mr. Schultze brings out.

Harry C. Cockrum (Montana State University): If this amendment is passed, is the effective date to be August 1?

President Cross: An interpretation, as opposed to legislation, becomes operative immediately unless the Convention changes the Council's mind.

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas): I feel very strongly about this legislation, as some of you probably know. In this day and age of oversolicitude of students, I feel this may be the time to make a little directive.

I question there is a student-athlete operating, particularly in football, who does not know whether he is going to get a grant-in-aid for that fall after spring practice. All this legislation does cost us more money in inviting that third- and fourth-string athlete who will be a senior to drop out as soon as he has signed the book.

Samuel E. Barnes (Howard University): I feel very strongly about this, as Wade Stinson does, in the opposite direction.

Gentlemen, there is no denying it. There are many instances where a boy has been thrown out, for what reason I don't need to go into detail. We know this has been done deliberately by many coaches who play footsie with the players because they have so many scholarships. They commit themselves to too many people, they must now meet some of the obligations.

The Council knows my feeling on this is very strong. I guess the strength of it has somehow rubbed off. There have been many instances of young men who have been deliberately denied the right to know whether or not they are going to keep their grants. There is no difficulty in getting them in school. The coaches know who their players are. They know enough about them, have books on them. They know what they eat. They know where they sleep. So this is not really in my judgment germane to this proposal which is to give the young man an opportunity to know whether he is going to be given a grant or not given a grant. I don't think we should be bickering about this.

[Amendment E to Proposed Interpretation No. 1 was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposed Interpretation No. 1 (page A-21), as amended, was approved, 188 to 54.]

Frank Carver (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I move that O.I. 2-(e) be amended by the addition of the words: "It is not permissible for an institution to repurchase the complimentary tickets awarded to its student-athletes." [The motion was seconded.]

There was a discussion at the Convention last year in which there was some confusion as to whether or not such purchase was legitimate. Therefore, the Council has put this proposal before you. (Proposed Interpretation No. 2, page A-22.)

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): I was unaware of the discussion on this because we have had a rule on our books now for 15 years that specifically permits us to repurchase tickets. It is a good rule. If you give the athletes the tickets you assume they either give them to their parents or their friends or if this is not true they can certainly sell them for the face value of the ticket. If they do not donate them to the parents or friends, it is much better for the institution to buy them back than to give them to the student-athletes and run the chance of their selling the tickets for not only the face value but additional funds.

We figure it is much better to keep them out of their hands, thereby eliminating the risk of their selling them at an inflated price. This, as all of you know, is one of the stories that you hear in regard to recruiting violations, that if you go to X school you can get complimentary tickets and sell them for X dollars in excess of the face value.

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, after my remarkable record this morning when the Convention passed six amendments without an opposing vote, I hesitate to put my statement

on record, but I must oppose this amendment. We have had it on our books for a number of years, and I see nothing wrong whatever in allowing the institution to pay the going price in order to keep student-athletes from selling the tickets. I don't like to see our student-athletes go out and sell tickets, and particularly I don't like the idea that sometimes there is an opportunity for students to scalp season tickets for transportation and other things.

Repurchase of tickets is the most legitimate practice we can have. I am very disappointed that the Council endorsed this, and I ask you to vote against it.

[Proposed Interpretation No. 2 (page A-22) was approved, 177-57.]

Awards

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of proposed Interpretation No. 3, combining O.I. 19 and O.I. 20 (pages A-22 and A-23). [The motion was seconded.]

I now propose Amendment F (pages A-23 and A-24) to the proposed Interpretation.

[Note: Mr. McWhorter proceeded to review the changes Amendment F would make in the original proposal.]

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment F. [The motion was seconded.]

You who have been attending this Convention for several years realize this is not a new piece of legislation. It is another attempt, however, on the part of our Council to establish some guidelines on this rather difficult problem and at the same time to allow for anything that can be conceived by man to be presented.

[Amendment F (pages A-23 and A-24) was approved by voice vote.]

Axel C. Bundgaard (St. Olaf College): Does this rule apply to those student-athletes who might be participating in contests and events for which awards are made? I refer specifically to golf.

President Cross: I believe paragraph (b) will take care of that.

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, as Mr. McWhorter said, this has been under discussion for some time. I am not convinced in my own mind that the legislation is the same in O.I. 19 and O.I. 20. However, if there is the requirement for more detailed legislation, it appears to me that the problem should be divided into two types of competition—one of the team variety, and the other such as track which is individual competition.

If this legislation is adopted, the youngster who is a fine sprinter may go to a track meet each weekend, win the 100 and 220, and receive a \$75 watch, while a youngster playing on championship baseball team could get an award equivalent to \$75 for his season's competition. It seems rather ridiculous to have a rule of that nature. If we need detailed legislation, these two types of awards could be approved from a different angle. Probably the monetary limitation on the award for each individual event should be lowered from the \$75 level and the \$75 level should be increased for the award for the team events.

[Proposed Interpretation No. 3 (pages A-22 and A-23), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Institutional Eligibility

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Proposed Interpretation No. 4 (page A-24) provides for the revision of O.I. 112, to be in

conformity with legislation we have already approved at this Convention. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Arthur W. Nebel (University of Missouri, Columbia): Mr. President, Proposed Interpretation No. 5 (page A-24) is a revision of O.I. 115. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: The Academic Testing Committee, with the concurrence of the Council, requests the approval of the revision of O.I. 117, as indicated in Proposed Interpretation No. 6 (page A-24).

I move the adoption of the proposal. [The motion was seconded.]

The College Board Examination now tests in 3200 centers in the United States and at least 2800 of these are on six dates. The dates this year—and they are comparable each year—are November 1, December 6, January 10, March 8, April 2 and July 11.

Further, the College Board will arrange a second center for national administration for anyone who must travel more than 75 miles.

With the ACT there are five testing dates this year—October 18, December 13, February 21, April 25 and July 18. Again, the days are comparable each year. There are some 2300 testing centers in the United States today. By the way, there are some overseas. So it should not be difficult for a student to take the test.

This comes also to the Committee from the recommendation of both ACT and the College Board (SAT) since they are not satisfied with the validity of some of the tests not given under national administration.

Earl Lory (University of Montana): My institution requires the ACT for every incoming freshman. We have anywhere from 100 to 300 incoming freshmen.

For those who have not taken the test on reporting to the institution we require a test during the first week. This is not a national test. The freshman who takes that test cannot be retested. If the amendment is passed I am in trouble. I rather suspect that other institutions will be in the same trouble.

Mr. Fuzak: Mr. President, since the national test is the only test by which a prediction may be determined, the test on campus is perfectly appropriate for an institution to determine admission or relate to the admission requirement, but will no longer be acceptable to determine the prediction of a student.

So while this test is given—and I am thinking only for myself—in a situation such as this you can contact the Academic Testing Committee, and I doubt there would be any difficulty in arranging for those students to establish their prediction at the next national test date.

I am offering an opinion which I have not discussed in the Committee, but I believe this would be a reasonable approach.

[Proposed Interpretation No. 6 (page A-24) was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Fuzak: Proposed Interpretation, No. 7 (pages A-24 and A-25) takes into account the fact that our Committee, which worked on developing the new table, was somewhat late in gathering the necessary data. As a result, this proposal makes us legitimate by changing September 1, 1969 to "during the fall and winter of the 1969-70 Academic year." The new table will apply to those student-athletes in

member institutions after May 1, 1970.

I move the approval of this interpretation.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting—Tryouts

Marshall S. Turner, Jr. (Johns Hopkins University): Mr. President, in reference to Proposed Interpretation No. 8 (page A-25), I move that O.I. 135 be amended by the deletion of the words "or a national sports federation of which this Association is a member." [The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this is to clear up a little confusion which exists in administration.

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting—Visitation

Edwin Cady (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of a new O.I. 153, as stated in Proposal No. 9 (pages A-25). [The motion was seconded.]

There is a sense in which you have moved toward approval of this, because it related, as I pointed out this morning, to Amendment No. 34 (page A-17), which has the obvious effect of clarifying for coaches and directors not only their opportunity, but their responsibility to entertain the student who comes, as some of our loving recruits do, repeatedly on his own, and of course to help with the expense.

[Proposed Interpretation No. 9 was approved by voice vote.]

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Proposed Interpretation No. 10 applies to Article 6, Section 5, of the Bylaws which we amended this morning by adopting Amendments No. 34 and 35 (pages A-17 and A-18). This item has to do with the accumulative aspects of campus visits.

Mr. President, I move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I have spoken to the Parliamentarian and it is my understanding it would be possible to provide an amendment to this proposal.

I propose that it be amended by adding the word "in" before the word "any", and following the word "subsequent" add the words "twelve-month period of" so the proposition would read: "The total limitations set forth in Bylaw 6-5 apply accumulatively to a prospective student-athlete in high school as well as in any subsequent twelve-month period of time he is a student in a college preparatory school or junior college."

The purpose of this is to facilitate arrangements with junior colleges. If this is approved, a student may visit the campus twice when he is in high school and if he does that he may thereafter not visit on a paid visit. It seems to me, having left high school, if he should elect to go to a junior college, and a period of a year or so elapses, then it might very well be far more important in terms of the real purpose of the campus visit to have him come in at that later time.

Again, if he makes two visits while he is in high school, that ends the visits he may make as a high school student, but if thereafter he enrolls in a college preparatory school, or junior college, he should not have more than two visits in any one twelve-month period after that occurs.

Also, I suggest that Article 6, Section 8, calls attention to the fact that

anybody who wants to apply for an appointment to talk to a student who has enrolled in the junior college must get the permission of that institution before he makes contact with that student.

I call the attention of the Council to a void that ought to be filled, and that is that new O.I. 154 applies to high school students and students who are in college preparatory schools or junior colleges, but there is nothing in this O.I. 154 that concerns students who are graduating from high school but do not attend either a college preparatory school or a junior college. I suggest that the Council pay some attention to that with the thought that it may wish also to write an additional official interpretation that would call for some further limitation on the number of visits a student might make who is in that position.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment G (page A-25). [The motion was seconded.]

Wade R. Stinson (University of Kansas): I would like to ask Mr. Ray to clarify a point. A young man visits twice in high school. On his first year in junior college does he have two visits?

Mr. Ray: He might.

Mr. Stinson: The second year, does he have two more visits?

Mr. Ray: He might, as long as he does not have more than two in any twelve-month period following his graduation from high school.

[Amendment G to Proposed Interpretation 10 was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposed Interpretation No. 10 (page A-25), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting—Entertainment

Edwin Cady (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment of O.I. 154 as set forth in Proposed Interpretation No. 11 (page A-26). [The motion was seconded.]

There are two amendments proposed. One goes to your having agreed not to do anything about the problem of home visits, but to see if the Recruiting Committee can unscramble itself. The other goes to an objection from the Council to a clause.

I move Mr. Chairman, that we amend Proposal No. 11, first of all, by deleting the words "with and conducted by regular students." Simply put a period after "campus."

Then delete everything after "may not provide an automobile for his use." [The motion was seconded.]

President Cross: The second part of Mr. Cady's motion is to delete the last three sentences, and is designed to accommodate the referral of the two-visit rule to the Recruiting Committee. It relates to that proposed designation and seems to be inappropriate in an official interpretation now.

[Amendment H (page A-26) to Proposed Interpretation No. 11 was approved by voice vote.]

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): In view of the deletion of the words "home community and communities contiguous thereto" we find ourselves in some difficulty with respect to the definition of the institution's campus, and I would appreciate it if I could have clarification as to how we define the campus.

In our particular institution there are two areas, large areas, classroom buildings, and within five miles a large plant where they build planes and other facilities used by the university.

Mr. Cady: I am not quite sure, Max, that I can give you guidance, but I can tell you what sort of thing was in the Committee's mind in proposing this. Obviously there is diversity in American universities in their locations and their facilities. In some of our institutions it is obvious and no one could possibly misunderstand. There are a great many of them where it is not obvious at all. There are some institutions which really do not have a campus in any normal sense of the word and we tried to take account of this.

We also tried to take into account the various campus facilities where entertainment is not available. One man pointed out that on his campus in the summertime the institution tends to close its facilities and there is simply nothing available for the prospective student-athlete.

It does seem to me that there is a possibility here of a reasonable accommodation. As you suggested, in your own phrasing, the institution itself could propose as a matter of definition what it regards as legitimately its campus, what kinds of experiences the student-athlete ought to have if he is to take advantage of the opportunity to visit in order to find out what kind of place it is. What is it like here? What is the scale and quality of campus life for the student?

[Proposed Interpretation No. 11, as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Extra Events

President Cross: Proposed Interpretation No. 12 involves essentially a housekeeping matter. It has not been clarified or specified as to when the eligibility forms should be sent in from institutions which play post-season football. This interpretation is designed to make that explicit. The Extra Events Committee finds the absence of some explicitness to be difficult. I will entertain a motion to approve the interpretation.

[Motion was regularly made, seconded and passed by voice vote to approve Proposed Interpretation No. 12, page A-27.]

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Proposed Amendment No. 13 (page A-27) adds a new O.I. 172 to define the word "hardship" as used in Bylaw 7A-1-(f).

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the new O.I. 172.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Limitation on Playing Seasons

Mr. McWhorter: Mr. President, Proposal No. 14 (page A-27) provides for the revision of O.I. 178 to require freshmen football teams to undergo a three-day conditioning period similar to that required of the varsity team prior to the beginning of contact drills.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting—Tryouts

Milton F. Hartvigsen (Brigham Young University): Mr. President and gentlemen: The NCAA Council, at its meeting of January 10, 1970, approved Proposal Interpretation No. 15 (page A-27) and presents it to the 64th NCAA Convention for review.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this new interpretation.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting—Pre-College Expense

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the new O.I. 163 to Bylaw 6-7-(a) which is spelled out in Proposal No. 16 (page A-28). [The motion was seconded.]

Lysle Butler (Oberlin College): Bylaw Article 6, Section 7, says, in part: "furthermore, an institution or its representatives may not offer, provide or arrange financial assistance for a prospective student-athlete to obtain a postgraduate education."

Are these two items irreconcilable or do I misread them?

Mr. Flynn: At the present time we are not allowed, as you say, to offer a prospective student-athlete a postgraduate education. However, this states specifically that it is not offered to a prospective student-athlete. It can only be offered to a senior. No longer is he a prospect. He is a student-athlete, and we limit it to two, so it would not be used for recruiting purposes.

[Proposed Interpretation No. 16 was defeated by voice vote.]

President Cross: At previous Conventions, the Executive Regulations have, of course, been printed, but have been part of the report of the Executive Committee and adopted by that medium. You might have thought these frequently are not of importance and that it was not worth while to have them come to your attention individually.

10. OTHER PROPOSALS

Revisions of Executive Regulations

Wilford H. Ketz (Union College—New York): Mr. President, Revision No. 1 (page A-29) amends Executive Regulation 2, Section 3-(c), third paragraph. It replaces the third paragraph with a new paragraph: "The place standings of College Division student-athletes competing in National Collegiate Championship events shall not be considered in compiling team scores."

Mr. President, I move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

Since this has been proposed there have been two questions in regard to its interpretation.

One is that the restriction applies only to sports in which the NCAA conducts two championships. When only a National Collegiate Championship is conducted, College Division teams and individuals score as usual.

In addition, the question has arisen as to what would happen to the points scored by College Division teams, and the Executive Committee has ruled that the points will be vacated.

This revision comes to you with the unanimous approval of the College Committee and the approval of the Council. The College Committee believes that our College Division Championships should be the culmination of our teams' efforts. We appreciate a great deal the opportunity of going beyond the National Collegiates, the University Division Championship, but we believe this should be restricted to an individual basis and not team.

The College Committee further believes that to permit scoring and the placing of College Division teams in the National Championship could well become an invitation for University teams to enter the College Division, and then go on. In other words, you have a chance at two championships.

During the past year, the first year of the new classification system, we have had only two requests for changes. We think it is working well. We are very proud of our College Division program and especially of our eight championships, which may soon become nine.

Dwight Reed (Lincoln University): I speak in opposition to this because I believe any institution that pays dues, meets the requirements

and standards and is allowed to compete in the National Collegiate Championship should get all the benefits from that championship which includes scoring points.

If this legislation is passed and we don't count points, why run at all? [Revision No. 1 (page A-29) was approved, 99 to 96.]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Revision No. 2 (page A-29). [The motion was seconded.]

The point is to establish the date at which the institution must have certified that it is operating in conformity with our Bylaws. Otherwise it is pretty much the same as far as being in good standing, and so forth. [Revision No. 2 was approved by voice vote.]

Ernest McCoy (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. President and Gentlemen: I move to amend Executive Regulation 2, Section 7-(a), by adding a new sentence as it appears in Revision No. 3 (page A-30).

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Wayne Duke (Big Eight Conference): Mr. President, I have been asked, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to submit three proposed revisions of the Executive Regulations pertaining to specifications for advertising.

Revision No. 4 (page A-30) establishes advertising policy for programs of events. I move its adoption. [The motion was seconded.]

Revisions No. 5 and No. 6 reflect the same intent, providing for advertising policies in regard to radio and television, respectively.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. President, these proposals provide that no professional sports organization will be permitted to have advertising in programs on television or radio. This is a negative approach to our relationship with professional sports organizations, and the inference is, as I interpret it, that perhaps they are somewhat unacceptable and out of bounds.

Those of us who live in metropolitan areas know the professional sports organizations have made a tremendous impact. Many of you are aware of the civic involvement in the professional sports organizations.

We find many of the supporters of the professional organizations are also our friends and supporters. This applies to faculty, staff members and students.

For this reason, I do not believe that the NCAA could gain anything by deliberately pointing the shaft at professional sports organizations.

Furthermore, we must adjust ourselves to reality. They are with us, gentlemen, and we are living in this kind of society.

Finally, I call your attention to the fact that if this policy is adopted without any changes it is a very small step from here to proceed to the point where the NCAA is going to dictate how each individual member conducts its public relations.

I offer, on behalf of the University of Minnesota—Twin Cities, an amendment to Revisions No. 4, 5 and 6, by striking therein all references to professional sports organizations. [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Duke: As an individual, I do not construe this as a negative approach to the over-all problem of college-professional relations. Rather it is an attempt to utilize our own collegiate forces to promote that which we firmly believe. Simply stated, I believe the point is: Don't advertise competitive shows.

Mr. Schultze: May I make one comment on that? It has been our experience that it is possible to cooperate in some degree with professional

sports organizations. We have found it very worthwhile to promote them in the Twin Cities.

[Amendment I to Revisions No. 4, 5 and 6 (pages A-30 and A-31) was approved, 113 to 65.]

[Revision No. 4, as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

[NOTE: The foregoing deleted the language to be added in Revisions No. 5 and 6, making consideration of them unnecessary.]

James H. Weaver (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, I move that Executive Regulation 3, Section 2-(e) be amended as shown in Revision No. 7 (page A-31).

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Revision of Recommended Policies

Stan Bates (Washington State University): Mr. President and Members of the Convention: I call your attention to Revision No. 1 (page A-32) which amends Policy 5 by designating the present paragraph Section 1 and adding Section 2. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Revision of Enforcement Procedure

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. Chairman, this Revision of Enforcement Procedure refers to pages 76-79 of the 1969 Manual where the entire enforcement procedure of the Association is outlined as approved by the Council and the Convention of the Association.

As a recommendation of the NCAA Committee on Infractions endorsed by the NCAA Council, we propose to add one sentence to that enforcement procedure, saying "Previous violations of NCAA legislation shall be a contributing factor in determining the degree of penalty."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this revision. [The motion was seconded.]

This language makes more explicit what is already carried on in enforcement procedure. We cannot escape the fact that previous violations are considered in connection with enforcement. We want to put those institutions on notice that repeated violations will be subject to additional penalty.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Is this proposal of the Committee on Infractions directed toward previous violations by NCAA institutions or by NCAA institutional staff members? It would seem to me our penalties are directed only against institutions and if the institution no longer has the staff persons who were involved in the previous violation, the previous violation should not be a contributing factor in determining the penalty.

Mr. Davis: That is true. What has occurred in the institution itself is taken into consideration in the determination of any penalty.

Mr. Ray: Does the revision refer to violation of NCAA legislation by the institutional staff members or by the institution? This is an important basis in determining the procedure.

Mr. Davis: I have not considered it referred to either one or the other. It refers simply to violations of legislation, regardless of whether it might result as an institutional penalty.

Mr. Ray: If the institution purges its staff of the members involved, then the previous violation should not be a contributing factor in determining the penalty. Each case should be judged on its merits in terms of the institution at that moment.

Mr. Davis: All we are doing here is attempting to make more explicit what already exists. This will result in no substantial change. It is simply to put on notice a factor which is in consideration of the violation.

A. A. White (University of Houston): Does "shall be a contributing factor" mean that the previous violation shall be considered but it may or may not lengthen the penalty or that it will lengthen the penalty by the mere fact that it exists?

Mr. Davis: It will be considered. There are always two judgments involved in these cases; one a preliminary judgment and recommendation from the Infractions Committee, and then the final conclusion or judgment on the part of the Council. Those are simply considerations; they are not requirements.

Mr. White: If they were found sufficiently unrelated under all circumstances, it does not mean they would be considered?

Mr. Davis: You are right. There would be nothing in that that would prejudice any previous action. It puts the institution on notice that repeated violations will be taken into consideration.

J. William Orwig (Indiana University): It is quite pertinent whether this particular legislation refers to the institution or whether it refers to the coach of the institution. I wonder if there is a statute of limitations relative to the length of time elapsing between one violation and another.

You know I am speaking from experience.

Mr. Davis: Yes, I do, Mr. Orwig, and I appreciate that. This is not directed toward a long-standing feud or anything of this sort. I served a great many years on the Infractions Committee and I have served a good many years on the Council. I have listened to both viewpoints, and I am convinced the procedure is eminently fair. But I am also convinced that when the Infractions Committee recommends a penalty and the Council approves a penalty, it is not going to be retroactive in the sense of looking back at long-standing violations.

[The Revision of Enforcement Procedure (page A-33) was approved, 143 to 34.]

Resolution

President Cross: I am sure all of you are aware there have been for some time varying degrees of belief that our legislation needs to be looked at as a whole to harmonize, rationalize and draft changes that would fit into some sort of reasonable presentation as a whole.

The Council has assigned this task to George Young, former dean of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin, Professor of Law, a longtime member and chairman of the Infractions Committee, and, as a consequence, with perhaps as much knowledge of both our Constitution and Bylaws, as anyone in our institutions, not including that particular group of knowledgeable people in our executive office in Kansas City. He will present to the Council at its April meeting a draft. The Council will study that proposal and accept suggestions for revision or improvement. We expect to have the proposal in final form in August.

The Resolution (page A-34) is designed to implement this procedure and simplify the shift from whatever the language now is to whatever the language might be, assuming that the new language is acceptable.

You will notice it requires that the document in its final form be cir-

cularized to all members no later than September 15 of this year, so that it can be studied and evaluated. If this resolution is adopted, that document will be before the next Convention for adoption or amendment in the normal fashion.

The change in the ordinary effective date of our legislation, as adopted earlier, means that our action at the next Convention would take effect prior to the following school year, but that would not preclude the Convention from taking action on something which would be urgent and take effect immediately. There is nothing in this proposal which precludes corrective action of an emergency nature.

I ask for unanimous consent to correct the date stated here so that it will become effective on August 1 rather than September 1, 1971. If there is no objection to that, we will have unanimous consent to shifting the date of any new document taking effect.

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): Mr. Chairman, would that preclude the motion to put into effect legislation that we passed this morning?

President Cross: No.

I will entertain a motion to adopt the Resolution.

[The motion was regularly made, seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Revisions of Executive Regulations

Tom Hamilton (Pacific Eight Conference): Mr. President, is it possible to have a reconsideration of the vote—I know it was quite conclusive—on the amendments proposed by Wayne Duke, relative to program advertising, radio and television? (Revisions No. 4, No. 5 and No. 6, pages A-30 and A-31.)

I am sure Max Schultze has had a fine experience with professional organizations and I have many, many friends in professional sports, but the history of our relationship for the past 15 years has been that professional sports organizations, while we are friendly personally, have tried continuously to move into areas which have been historically ours and where we have great interest. They have made inroads, but we are recovering from some of the losses that we have had.

As a member of the Television Committee, listening to the members who called me when Coca-Cola would have an advertisement of John Brodie, a Forty-niner, on our television program, they would say, "What are you doing on that Television Committee? Are you advertising our opponents?"

I just cannot understand the action we have taken. It doesn't mean that we are feuding with the professionals, but certainly we are in the same activities that they are. We have seen their activities in moving into Saturdays whenever they can to televise and take our ratings down. They have done this on Friday night, and we have had to take legislative action to stop them from making those inroads on amateur sports.

So I see no possible reason why we should not exclude them from our advertising.

I move for reconsideration of those amendments. [The motion was seconded.]

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): So that everybody is perfectly clear on it, this advertising restriction is only for programs and broadcasts of NCAA events.

[The motion to reconsider was approved, 108 to 54.]

C. D. Henry (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I represent a conference made up of eight black colleges. We would like an interpretation of the headline on pages 2 and 3 of the December NCAA NEWS. Does the headline which reads, "Militant Groups Do Disservice to Black College Athletes," refer to our college campuses or does it refer to black athletes at colleges in the United States?

I asked this question yesterday in my caucus and I couldn't get any answer. That is why I bring it to the floor.

President Cross: It refers to the latter.

Mr. Henry: Thank you.

Charles Capps (University of Miami—Florida): At Miami we are very much opposed to professional sports advertising. We are in a death struggle in Miami right now and I cannot speak strongly enough on this matter of professional football's encroachment.

Jesse Hill (University of Southern California): In the city of Los Angeles, we have a good relationship with the professional teams, but I feel exactly the opposite about it that Max Schultze feels. I am not sure what the situation is going to be in Minneapolis in a few years. I know what the situation is in Atlanta, Georgia. I know what it is in Los Angeles, and I know what it is in San Francisco. I know what it is in Chicago, and you all know what it is in New York City at the present time.

It has been said that each individual institution can handle its own advertising the way it wishes, but, gentlemen, we are fighting a life-or-death struggle, and I do feel as far as the NCAA is concerned that we have to adopt the motion to restrict professional sports advertising if we are going to survive.

Samuel Saucedo (Marquette University): Marquette University and others are in the brewery district in Milwaukee. There are seven breweries advertising in our programs. This proposal means that breweries could not advertise in our programs. Is that right?

President Cross: No. That is not correct. These proposals apply to advertising in connection with NCAA championship events. They do not apply in any respect to the institution's individual policy.

[Revision No. 4 (page A-30) was approved by voice vote.]

[Motions to approve Revisions No. 5 and No. 6 (page A-31) were regularly made, seconded and approved by voice vote.]

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): Mr. Chairman, I move that Amendment No. 2 (page A-1) and Amendment No. 8 (page A-4) be effective February 1, 1970. [The motion was seconded and approved, 170 to 14.]

11. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. President and Gentlemen: As you entered the Ballroom this afternoon, each of you received the Report of the Committee on Committees.

I wish to thank the members of the Committee for their efforts. They had previously solicited your recommendations and we were able to complete our business quite rapidly. I also wish to thank Miss Fannie Vaughn for her contributions as secretary to the Committee.

[Note: The members of the Committee on Committees are listed on page A-35. Following is a listing of the members appointed to each committee. A complete listing of all NCAA committees may be found on pages 88-106 of the 1970-71 NCAA Manual.]

Following are the Committee's nominations:

Baseball Rules and Tournament: Chal Port, The Citadel; Robert M. Wren, Ohio University; Frank Windegger, Texas Christian University; John Connelly, Northeastern University.

Basketball Rules: Dick Harter, University of Pennsylvania; Bill Menefee, Baylor University; Jim Padgett, University of California, Berkeley; Norvall Neve, Atlantic Coast Conference (chairman); Jerry Simmons, Monrovia (Calif.) High School; Richard Baldwin, Broome Technical Community College.

Football Rules: Joe Zabilski, Northeastern University; Stan Sherriff, University of Northern Iowa; Eddy Schluntz, Brookline (Mass.) High School.

Swimming Rules and Meet: Bill Harlan, University of Florida; Jack McGuire, Iowa State University; Vic Gustafson, Gustavus Adolphus College; Jerry Hinsdale, University of California, Davis; Don Van Rossen, University of Oregon (chairman).

Track and Field Rules and Meet: Jim Tuppeny, University of Pennsylvania; DeLoss Dodds, Kansas State University; Berny Wagner, Oregon State University; Orville Gregory, Johnson County Community College; Dixon Farmer, Occidental College (secretary-rules editor).

Wrestling Rules and Tournament: LeRoy Alitz, U.S. Military Academy; Hap Whitney, University of Missouri, Columbia; John Reese, Wilkes College; Warren Williamson, South Dakota State University; Dave Adams, University of Pittsburgh (secretary-rules editor); Edroy Kringstad, Bismarck Junior College.

Fencing Rules and Meet: Archie Simonson, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Robert Kaplan, Ohio State University (chairman).

Gymnastics Rules and Meet: Frank Wolcott, Springfield College; Edward Gagnier, Iowa State University (chairman).

Ice Hockey Rules and Tournament: John Kelley, Boston College; John McComb, Ohio University (chairman).

Lacrosse Rules and Tournament: Maj. James H. Keating, Jr., U.S. Air Force Academy; Bruce Allison, Union (N.Y.) College (chairman).

Skiing Rules and Meet: John Bower, Middlebury College.

Soccer Rules and Tournament: Ted Smith, West Springfield (Mass.) High School.

Baseball Tournament, College Division: William Lakie, University of California, Davis.

Basketball Tournament, University Division: Ernest C. Casale, Temple University; Joel Eaves, University of Georgia; Tom Scott, Davidson College (chairman).

Cross Country Meet, College Division: Ed Tucker, U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

Football Playoffs, College Division: Rex Grossart, Chico State College; Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College (chairman).

Golf Tournament: Richard D. Gordin, Ohio Wesleyan University.

Tennis Tournament: Rolla Anderson, Kalamazoo College.

Volleyball Tournament: Norman F. Kunde, University of Washington.

College Committee: Ross Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Vanette W. Johnson, Arkansas AM&N University; Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College.

Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports: Olav B. Kollevoll, Lafayette College.

Constitution and Bylaws: John Kane, University of Arkansas.

Extra Events: Abe Martin, Texas Christian University; Wade Stinson, University of Kansas (chairman).

Water Polo Rules and Tournament: James Schultz, California State College, Long Beach (chairman); Alan Field, Queens College; Lee Walton, San Jose State College; Melvin R. Patterson, Texas A&M University.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, I move these nominations be approved,

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

12. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

J. William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, the Nominating Committee wishes to place before this Convention the following for Officers and members of the NCAA Council:

For President—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington.

For Secretary-Treasurer—William J. Flynn, Boston College.

For Vice-Presidents—District One, Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; District Three, H. Boyd McWhorter, University of Georgia; District Five, David Swank, University of Oklahoma; District Seven, Louis A. Myers, University of Arizona.

For Vice-President-At-Large—Wilford H. Ketz, Union (N.Y.) College.

For Member-At-Large—Adolph W. Samborski, Harvard University.

Mr. President, I move that the Report of the Nominating Committee be accepted.

[Mr. Davis assumed the Chair; the motion was seconded and approved by voice vote. A complete listing of the Council may be found on pages 5 and 6.]

President Cross: I appreciate the honor and privilege of being elected for another year. I am sure I speak for Bill Flynn, too, when I say you have an excellent Council and Executive Committee. It has been a pleasure, and I hope this year will be even more fruitful.

I will entertain a motion to commend Gene Duffy, NCAA director of events, and those who worked with him, for the Convention arrangements which were done so well.

[The motion was regularly made, seconded and approved by voice vote.]

[The Convention adjourned at 4:50 p.m.]

Appendix A

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[NOTE: In the following proposed amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All amendments shall be effective upon adoption unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1969 NCAA Manual.]

PRINCIPLES OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

No. 1. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, page 5, by adding paragraph (c) as follows:

“(c) Staff members of member institutions and others serving on the Association’s committees or acting as consultants shall not, directly or by implication, use the Association’s name or their affiliation with the Association in the endorsement of products or services.”

Source: NCAA Executive Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit individuals from using their NCAA affiliation in the endorsement of products or services.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 2. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, page 5, by adding paragraph (c) as follows:

“(c) Staff members of the athletic department of a member institution shall not participate directly or indirectly in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star football or basketball contest involving college student-athletes which is not certified by the Association’s Extra Events Committee.”

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit athletic department employees of member institutions from assisting in the conduct of uncertified all-star football and basketball games.

Action: Passed by vote of 254-9; effective immediately.

FIVE-YEAR RULE

No. 3. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10-(a), page 6, as follows:

“An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletic competition unless he meets the following requirements of eligibility:

“(a) He must complete his seasons of participation within five calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which he first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed services, on official church missions, or with recognized foreign aid services of the United States Government or

out of college on the direction of a competent physician due to illness being excepted. [NOTE: The Council may by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting approve exceptions to this paragraph on behalf of student-athletes of the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have eligibility remaining.]”

Source: State University of New York at Albany.

Intent: To make an exception to the five-year rule for student-athletes required to withdraw from college because of illness.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

PRINCIPLES GOVERNING INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 4. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10-(c), page 6, as follows:

“(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 8; such participation shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. **A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team.** [NOTE: The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition officially approved by the Department of State of the U. S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition.]”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To allow students with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in basketball to compete as a member of their high school's alumni team.

Action: Passed by vote of 272-29; effective immediately.

No. 5. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10-(c), page 6, as follows:

“(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 8; such participation shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico and participation in the annual East-West All-Star Game, sponsored by the National Association of Basketball Coaches, is are exempted from this ruling. [NOTE: The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international com-

petition officially approved by the Department of State of the U. S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition.]”

Source: MacMurray College.

Intent: To allow undergraduates to compete in the NABC East-West All-Star game.

Action: Withdrawn by MacMurray College.

No. 6. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10-(c), page 6, as follows:

“(c)” He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 8; such participation shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. [NOTE: The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American, or Olympic or Maccabiah Games tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition officially approved by the Department of State of the United States Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition.]”

Source: Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Yale University.

Intent: To specifically identify the Maccabiah Games as one of the the international competitions which may qualify for the waiver procedure.

Action: Tabled by voice vote.

No. 7. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10-(c), page 6, as follows:

“(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except:

“(1) During the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 8, or

“(2) During the period from June 15 to August 31, provided he obtains written permission from his institution's director of athletics (or the latter's official representative), and he competes on a team in a league approved by the NCAA.

“[NOTE 1. For a league to be approved, the following requirements must be met: (a) no member team shall include on its roster more than one undergraduate (with intercollegiate eligibility remaining) from any single college or junior college; (b) no member team shall have on its staff any person associated in any capacity with a college or junior college basketball program; (c) no member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player; (d) no player may

compete for more than one team or in more than one league; (e) no admission shall be charged for any game; (f) no all-star games of any kind shall be permitted, and (g) no postseason, playoff or tournament games shall be permitted.]

"Such participation shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball.

"Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling.

"[NOTE 2. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition officially approved by the Department of State of the United States Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition.]

Source: LeMoyne (N.Y.) College.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to compete in approved summer basketball leagues.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

No. 8. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10, page 7, by adding paragraph (f) as follows:

"(f) He shall be denied further intercollegiate athletic eligibility in all sports if he engages as a member of a squad in any college all-star football or basketball contest which is not certified by the Association's Extra Events Committee."

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To render ineligible for all intercollegiate sports students who participate in an uncertified college all-star football or basketball game.

Action: Approved by voice vote; effective immediately.

No. 9. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10, page 7, by adding paragraph (f), as follows:

"(f) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate track and field competition if, while a candidate for the intercollegiate team in track and field, he participates in track and field competition which is subject to the certification program specified in Bylaw 7B, but which has not been certified."

Source: NCAA Committee on Infractions, NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify present institutional responsibility in the administration of Bylaw 7B.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 10. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10, page 7, by adding paragraph (f), as follows:

"(f) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate gymnastics competition if, while a candidate for the intercollegiate team in gymnastics, he participates in gymnastics competition which

is subject to the certification program specified in Bylaw 7C, but which has not been certified."

Source: NCAA Committee on Infractions, NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify present institutional responsibility in the administration of Bylaw 7C.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

VICE-PRESIDENTS' REPORTS

No. 11. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 3-(c)-(2), page 11, as follows:

"(2) District Vice-Presidents. Each District Vice-President shall represent the interests of his district. He shall carefully observe the conduct of intercollegiate athletics within his district and shall *render a report in writing to the annual Convention on the conditions of athletics in his district, with advance* such suggestions and recommendations as he deems advisable. He shall determine the eligibility of applicants within his district for membership in the Association as provided in the Bylaws and shall perform such other duties as the President may designate."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate annual written reports by the District Vice-Presidents.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

AMENDMENTS

No. 12. Constitution: Amend Article 9, page 14, as follows:

"This Constitution may be amended at any annual Convention by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting; provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding the Convention. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before the Convention. A proposed amendment to the Constitution may be amended at the Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting; provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the Constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the final business session of the Convention. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session of the Convention. The Council, however, after deliberation may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in this Article provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council. **Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective**

live on the first day of September following adoption by the Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a new effective date for legislation.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote; effective immediately.

A. Amend proposal No. 12, last sentence, as follows:

"Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of *September August* following adoption by the Convention."

Source: State University of New York at Albany; NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

No. 13. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, page 49, as follows:

"These Bylaws may be amended at any annual Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding the Convention. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before the Convention. A proposed amendment to the Bylaws may be amended at the Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting; provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the Bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the final business session of the Convention. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session of the Convention. The Council, however, after deliberation may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in this Article provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council. **Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of September following adoption by the Convention.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a new effective date for legislation.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote; effective immediately.

B. Amend proposal No. 13, last sentence, as follows:

"Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of *September August* following adoption by the Convention."

Source: State University of New York at Albany; NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 14. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4, page 25, by deleting paragraph (a) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(a) From District 2 to District 3

West Virginia University, Morgantown"

Source: West Virginia University, NCAA Council.

Intent: To transfer its membership from District 3 to District 2.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 15. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4-(i), page 26, as follows:

"(i) From District 6 to District 7

*New Mexico, University of, Albuquerque
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces
Texas, University of, El Paso*"

Source: New Mexico State University, NCAA Council.

Intent: To transfer its membership from District 6 to District 7.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 16. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4-(k), page 26, as follows:

"(k) From District 8 to District 7

*Boise State College, Boise, Idaho
Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington
Idaho, University of, Moscow
Idaho State University, Pocatello*"

Source: Gonzaga University, NCAA Council.

Intent: To locate all members of the Big Sky Conference in District 7.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote; effective August 1, 1970.

COMMITTEES

No. 17. Bylaws: Amend Article 3 as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(a), second paragraph, page 27, as follows:

"The members of these committees shall be elected at an annual Convention of the Association and unless otherwise specified shall be on the staff of an active or allied member of the Association. The terms of the members of these committees are set forth in the following paragraphs. The members of each committee shall be elected for the term specified, except that a member elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected only for the unexpired portion of the term. Whenever it is necessary to adjust the membership of these committees so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be elected or re-elected for terms of fewer years than those specified, except that if a member is elected to fill a vacancy for one-half term or less he shall be eligible for reelection for a full term. Otherwise, a member may not succeed himself unless the following descriptions of the various committees specifically provide for an exception."

2. Amend Section 3-(a), second paragraph, page 33, as follows:

"Members of meet and tournament committees unless otherwise specified shall be on the staff of an active or allied or associate member of the Association. The terms of the members of the tournament committees are set forth in the following paragraphs and shall commence on the first day of September following

their election. The members of each committee shall be elected by the annual Convention for the term specified, except that a member elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected only for the unexpired portion of the term and such a member may be eligible for reelection if he is elected to fill a vacancy for one-half term or less. Whenever it is necessary to adjust the membership of these committees so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be elected or reelected for terms of fewer years than those specified. Otherwise, a member may not succeed himself unless the following descriptions of the various committees specifically provide for an exception."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To conform this Bylaw to the provisions of Constitution 4-3-(c).

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 18. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i), page 29 as follows:

"The Olympic Committee shall consist of *nine ten* members to serve for a *period of four years an Olympiad as determined by the U. S. Olympic Committee*, one member from each of the eight geographic districts of the Association and a *two members-at-large, one of the at-large members* to be elected as chairman. The Committee shall be elected by the annual Convention and members may be elected to succeed themselves. Terms of members shall commence *on the first day of September following their election with the quadriennial meeting of the U.S. Olympic Committee*. The Committee shall be responsible for the planning and direction of the Association's Olympic activities, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. Through annual reports, it shall keep the membership informed of any developments related to the national or international Olympic movement which should be brought to the attention of the universities and colleges of the nation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To increase the membership of the Olympic Committee from nine to ten, with the term of office to coincide with that of the U.S. Olympic Committee Board of Directors.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 19. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), second paragraph, page 30, as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the above committees to establish and maintain rules of play in their respective sports consistent with sound tradition of the respective sports and of such character as to insure good sportsmanship and healthful participation by the competitors. **Any rule of play may be reviewed by the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee, after consultation with the rules committee involved, determines that the rule is not appropriate for financial or administrative reasons, the Executive Committee may revoke or suspend such rule or take other action on the matter as it deems necessary. An appeal from such action of the Executive Committee may be made to the Council.**

NCAA rules committee meetings shall be conducted in conformity with Robert's Rules of Order and no committee may require a parliamentary procedure necessitating more than a two-thirds vote, including those motions pertaining to the rules, themselves. It shall also be the duty of the rules committees in sports for which national records are maintained to approve such records. The Council may authorize any rules committee to cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide machinery for reviewing playing rule changes which may have substantial administrative impact.

Action: Defeated, as amended, by vote of 84-214.

C. Amend proposal No. 19, first paragraph, as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the above committees to establish and maintain rules of play in their respective sports consistent with sound tradition of the respective sports and of such character as to insure good sportsmanship and healthful participation by the competitors. **Any rule of play or amendment of a rule of play passed after August 1, 1970,** may be reviewed by the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee, after consultation with the rules committee involved, determines that the rule is not appropriate for financial or administrative reasons, the Executive Committee may revoke or suspend such rule. *or take other action on the matter as it deems necessary.* An appeal from such action of the Executive Committee may be made to the Council."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

No. 20. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), third paragraph, page 31, as follows:

"The rules and meet or tournament committees for baseball, basketball, football, swimming, track and field and wrestling shall be elected on the district representation plan, under which not less than two members of a committee shall be elected each year. Members of the basketball and football rules committees shall be elected for terms of six years. Members of the baseball, swimming, track and field and wrestling rules and meet or tournament committees shall be elected for terms of four years. A member elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected for only the unexpired portion of the term and such a member may be eligible for reelection if he is elected to fill a vacancy for one-half term or less. A member may not succeed himself, except that the *secretaries secretary-rules editors* of the basketball, football, swimming, track and field, wrestling and baseball rules and meet or tournament committees may be reelected without restriction and a member may serve one term as chairman in addition to the years he may have served as a committee member. **The secretary-rules editor elected in each instance shall be one of the at-large members of the committee as specified in the following descriptions of the various committees. The chairmen**

of the basketball and football rules committees shall be at-large members of their respective committees. Whenever necessary to adjust the membership of these committees so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be elected or reelected for less than a full term."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm the title of secretary-rules editor in those instances indicated; to clarify the position of the secretary-rules editor, and to allow a chairman to serve a full term in addition to the term served as a committee member.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 21. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), fourth paragraph, page 31, as follows:

"The rules and meet or tournament committees for fencing, ice hockey, lacrosse, and skiing all shall consist of six members. One member of each committee shall be elected each year. All members of these committees shall be elected for terms of six years, except that a member elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected for only the unexpired portion of the term and such a member may be eligible for reelection if he is elected to fill a vacancy for one-half term or less. The Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee and the Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of seven members, one member to be elected each year. Members of these committees shall be elected for terms of seven years, except that a member elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected only for the unexpired portion of the term and may be eligible for reelection if elected to fill a vacancy of one-half term or less. No member of any of the six committees may succeed himself, but he may serve one term as chairman in addition to the years he may have served as a committee member. The chairman may designate a secretary-rules editor from the membership of the committee. Whenever necessary to adjust the membership of these committees so that at least one vacancy will occur each year, members may be elected or reelected for terms of less than six years, or in the case of the gymnastics and soccer committees, less than seven years."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide for reelection if elected to fill a vacancy of one-half term or less, and to empower the chairman to designate a secretary-rules editor from the membership of the committee.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 22. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), sixth paragraph, page 32 as follows:

"The chairman of any rules committee may designate a secretary or rules editor, or both, from the membership of the committee. The Executive Committee may appoint a secretary, a rules editor or advisory committees from non-members of any rules committee upon the request of the chairman of the committee."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To conform this Bylaw to the procedures confirmed by above amendments No. 20 and No. 21.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 23. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b), page 32, as follows:

"(b) The Football Rules Committee shall consist of fifteen members; one from each of the eight geographic districts, five at-large, one representative of junior college football interests and one representative of secondary school football interests. One at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four and one at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight. One of the members-at-large shall serve as chairman and one of the members-at-large shall serve as secretary-rules editor. The five at-large representatives shall be elected as follows: One from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four and one at-large representative from a College Division member in Districts Five through Eight. One of the three remaining members-at-large shall serve as chairman and one of the then remaining two members-at-large shall serve as secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify the representation of the five members-at-large.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 24. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(c), page 32, as follows:

"(c) The Basketball Rules Committee shall consist of fourteen members; one from each of the eight geographic districts, four at-large, one representative of junior college basketball interests and one representative of secondary school basketball interests. One at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four and one at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight. One at-large member of the committee shall be elected as chairman and one at-large member shall be designated as secretary-rules editor. The four at-large representatives shall be elected as follows: One from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four and one at-large representative from a College Division member in Districts Five through Eight. One of the two remaining members-at-large shall serve as chairman and the other member-at-large as secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify the representation of the four members-at-large.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 25. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, pages 32-33, as follows:

1. Amend Section 2-(d), page 32, as follows:

"(d) The Track and Field Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of fourteen members; one from each of the eight geographic districts, three at-large, one who shall represent ju-

nior college track and field interests and two who shall represent secondary school track and field interests. One at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and the other at-large representative shall be designated as secretary-rules editor. One of the members shall be elected as chairman."

2. Amend Section 2-(f), page 32, as follows:

"(f) The Swimming Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of thirteen members, one from each of the eight geographic districts, three at-large and two who shall represent secondary school swimming interests. One at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and the other at-large representative shall be designated as secretary-rules editor. One of the members shall be elected as chairman."

3. Amend Section 2-(g), pages 32-33, as follows:

"(g) The Wrestling Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of sixteen members, one from each of the eight geographic districts, three at-large, one who shall represent junior college wrestling interests and four who shall represent secondary school wrestling interests. One at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and the other at-large representative shall be designated as secretary-rules editor. One of the members shall be elected as chairman."

4. Amend Section 2-(m), page 33, as follows:

"(m) The Baseball Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of eleven members, one from each of the eight geographic districts, and three at-large. One at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one at-large representative shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and the other at-large representative shall be designated as secretary-rules editor. One member of the Committee shall be elected as chairman."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that in the above instances, the secretary also has the responsibility of rules editor.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 26. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, and Article 5, Section 2, as follows:

1. Amend Article 3, Section 2, page 33, by adding paragraph (n) as follows:

"(n) The Water Polo Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of four members, one of whom shall be elected chairman."

2. Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a), second paragraph, page 41, as follows:

"The Track and Field Rules and Meet Committee shall be responsible for the Association's Cross Country, Indoor Track and Field and Outdoor Track and Field Championships. *The Swimming Rules and Meet Committee shall be responsible for the Association's Swimming and Water Polo Championships.*"

Source: NCAA Executive Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish the Water Polo Rules and Tournament Committee and to transfer the administration of the Championship and the formulation of rules to that committee.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 27. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(e), page 34, as follows:

"(e) The College Basketball Tournament Committee shall consist of six members, with at least one member from each of the NCAA College Division Regions. One of the six shall be elected as chairman. The members shall be elected for terms of six four years., one member to be elected each year. A member elected to the chairmanship may serve as chairman six four years in addition to the years he may have served as a committee member. The College Basketball Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the College Basketball Tournament Committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Council

Intent: To reduce the terms of the members thereby giving more people an opportunity to serve on the Committee.

Action: Referred, by voice vote, to a special committee.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA EVENTS

No. 28. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Sections 1 and 2, as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football, and basketball and ice hockey; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he is a graduate of a junior college, or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 provided he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the

NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school.

[NOTE: Subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) unchanged.]

2. Amend Section 1-(e), page 37, as follows:

"(e) He must not previously have engaged in four seasons of varsity competition in the sport involved except for football, and basketball and ice hockey, in which sports he must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition, it being understood that:"

[NOTE: Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

3. Amend Section 1-(e)-(2), page 37, as follows:

"(2) Participation by a freshman on a varsity team must be charged as a season of varsity competition and must be counted as one of the seasons of varsity competition referred to above, except that participation by a freshman on the varsity football, or basketball or ice hockey team of a junior college or of an institution with an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250 shall not be counted as a season of varsity competition. Freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events in football or basketball or ice hockey unless they qualify under Section 2."

[NOTE: Subparagraph (3) unchanged.]

4. Amend Section 2, page 38, as follows:

"College Division Exceptions. The following exceptions to Section 1 are granted in connection with NCAA-sponsored College Division events:

"(a) Freshmen who are otherwise eligible may be permitted to compete in College Division football, and basketball and ice hockey events provided their institution has an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250. Such freshmen are eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition insofar as participation in these events is concerned.

"(b) Freshmen who compete on the varsity football, and basketball and ice hockey teams of College Division institutions which have an undergraduate male enrollment of 1250 or more are ineligible for College Division football, and basketball and ice hockey events as freshmen; however, they are eligible for three additional seasons of competition in such College Division events."

Source: Boston College.

Intent: To render freshmen ineligible for the National Collegiate Ice Hockey Championship.

Action: Tabled by vote of 113-109. Motion to reconsider defeated by vote of 116-132.

No. 29. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution for the purpose of eligibil-

ity only in the sports of football and basketball; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school and meets one or more of the following requirements:

"(i) He is a graduate of a junior college, or

"(ii) He presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or

"(iii) He presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500, provided he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school.

"(iv) He presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college.

"A student-athlete who did not predict a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if:

"(i) He is a graduate of a junior college, or

"(ii) He presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit and has spent at least two academic years (excluding summer sessions) in residence at a junior college."

Source: Special NCAA Committee on Junior College Relations, NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a non-predictor to be a graduate of a junior college, or present a minimum of 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit (provided he spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college) to become immediately eligible for NCAA-sponsored events and postseason football games.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 30. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d)-(2), page 36, as follows:

"(2) A student who transfers from a collegiate institution while he is disqualified or suspended for academic or disciplinary reasons must complete two calendar years of

residence at the certifying institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit students who have been disqualified academically at an institution to be eligible for NCAA events after one year of residence following transfer to an NCAA member institution.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA EVENTS

No. 31. Bylaws. Amend Article 4, Section 6-(a), second paragraph, page 39, as follows:

"A change in competitive designation from University Division to College Division may be accomplished by petitioning the NCAA College Committee, which in turn shall submit the request to the Executive Committee. **An institution desiring to change its competitive designation must notify the Association's executive director under postmark date not later than July 1.** If the change is approved by the Executive Committee, it shall become effective with the beginning of the academic year following submission of the petition."

Source: NCAA College Committee, NCAA Executive Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a notification date for institutions desiring to change their competitive designation from University Division to College Division. (Note: The language of this amendment as printed in the Official Notice was incorrect; however, the intent reflected the correct language which is shown above.)

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 32. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), page 40, by adding paragraph (3) as follows:

"(3) **Limits its initial scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or organized athletic practice sessions during the first year of residence of student-athletes transferring from another collegiate institution to those who meet the requirements outlined in subparagraph (2) above, except that a student-athlete who transfers from a junior college and who failed to predict 1.600 on the Association's national experience tables, must be a graduate of the junior college, or present a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit and must have spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions).**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify the 1.600 legislation as it applies to transfer students and require non-predictors transferring from a junior college to be a graduate of the junior college, or present a minimum of 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit and to have spent a minimum of two academic years in

residence at the junior college in order to be immediately eligible for the financial aid indicated, practice and participation.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

NCAA ATHLETIC EVENTS

No. 33. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a), and Article 3, Section 2-(h), as follows:

1. Add to Article 5, Section 1-(a), page 40, the following:

"**The National Collegiate Lacrosse Championship.**"

2. Amend Article 3, Section 2-(h), page 33, as follows:

"(h) **The Lacrosse Rules and Tournament Committee** shall consist of six members, one of whom shall be elected as chairman. There may be an advisory committee of six members elected from the U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish the National Collegiate Lacrosse Championship and provide for its administration.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

RECRUITING

No. 34. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5, page 42, by amending paragraph (b), adding a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(b) If institutional or conference regulations prohibit an institution from financing one visit of a prospective student-athlete as provided in paragraph (a), said institution may permit any person, at his own expense, to pay the transportation costs of a prospective student-athlete to visit the institution's campus one time, regardless of whether the person accompanies the prospect on his visit; further, any person, at his own expense, may transport or pay the transportation costs of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus of a member institution **one time**, provided such person, at his own expense, accompanies the prospective student-athlete on his visit. **Only actual round-trip transportation costs by direct route between the student's home and the institution's campus may be provided and such visit may not exceed two days and two nights.**

"(c) **No member institution may permit a prospective student-athlete to receive more than two expense-paid visits to its campus under the authorization of paragraphs (a) and (b). The two possible visits may occur in either sequence of time.**"

Source: NCAA Special Committee on Recruiting, NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the number of expense paid visits a prospective student-athlete may make to the campus of any one institution.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 35. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 43, as follows:

"(c) **No member institution may shall permit its athletic staff members or other representatives of its athletic interests to**

finance or arrange for the financing of the transportation costs incurred by relatives or friends of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus or elsewhere. **This prohibition does not apply when a prospective student-athlete travels in an automobile to visit the institution's campus in which case the institution is permitted to pay the round trip expense at the same mileage rate the institution allows for travel by its own personnel even though relatives or friends of the prospect accompany him in the automobile. This would count as a paid visit for each prospective student-athlete who made the trip. In all instances, entertainment of the party accompanying a prospective student-athlete to the campus shall be limited to two relatives (or legal guardians), and a given prospect's relatives (or legal guardians) may be entertained for one and only one visit not to exceed two days and two nights."**

Source: Special NCAA Committee on Recruiting, NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the number of persons who may be entertained and the number of times such entertainment may take place.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 36. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 6, page 43, by lettering the present paragraph as (b) and adding paragraph (a), as follows:

"(a) No member of an athletic staff or other representative of an institution's athletic interests may visit a prospective student-athlete or any member of his family for any purpose related directly or indirectly to recruitment more than two times at any site other than the institution's campus; except that a representative of an institution's athletic interests who lives in the prospect's home community or a contiguous community shall not be restricted to the two-visit limitation of this paragraph."

Source: Special NCAA Committee on Recruiting, NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit to two the number of off-campus visits to any one prospective student-athlete by representatives of an institution's athletic interests.

Action: Referred to Special Committee on Recruiting by vote of 196-101.

D. Amend proposal No. 36 as follows:

"(a) No member of an athletic staff or other representative of an institution's athletic interests may visit a prospective student-athlete or any member of his family for any purpose related directly or indirectly to recruitment more than two times at any site other than the institution's campus; except that a representative of an institution's athletic interests who lives in the prospect's home community or a contiguous community shall not be restricted to the two-visit limitation of this paragraph; and except that the limitation of this paragraph shall not apply to the athletic staff or representatives of the athletic interests of an institution to which the prospective student-athlete has indicated his acceptance of its grant of financial aid by his signature of a formal statement of intent or tender issued

by the institution."

Source: Big Ten Conference, Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Approved by vote of 144-131; motion to reconsider approved by vote of 169-81 and the amendment was then defeated by vote of 65-184.

No. 37. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 6, page 43, as follows:

"(b) Any staff member of an athletic staff or other representative of a member institution's athletic interests desiring to visit contact a prospective student-athlete at the student-athlete's high school, college preparatory school or junior college shall first contact that institution's executive officer or his authorized representative, explain the purpose of his call and request permission to contact the prospective student-athlete. Only if permission is granted may the contact be made at the high school, college preparatory school or junior college. No contact with a prospective student-athlete shall be made at the site of his school's athletic competition in which the prospect is a participant."

Source: Special NCAA Committee on Recruiting, NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit contact with a prospective student-athlete at the site of competition in which he is a participant.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

EXTRA EVENTS

No. 38. Bylaws: Amend Article 7A, Section 1-(j), page 45, as follows:

"(j) The management of any such game shall agree not to permit its selection committee(s) or any other representative of its interests to contact any prospective institution, either directly or indirectly, concerning the possibility of playing in its game prior to 12 noon (EST) of the Monday prior to the institution's last game or the third Monday in November, 6:00 p.m. (local time at the site at which the institution's football team is competing) of the Saturday prior to the institution's last game or the third Saturday in November, whichever is earlier or, if the game is played earlier than the second weekend in December, such contact shall not be made prior to three weeks before the date of the game."

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit contact with a prospective team on the indicated Saturday evening instead of the following Monday.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 39. Bylaws: Amend Article 7B, Section 2, page 46, as follows:

"The Extra Events Committee established under Bylaw 7A-2 shall be responsible for certifying that any given meet satisfies these qualifications and other applicable regulations and policies of the Association as determined by the annual Convention or NCAA Council. The management of a certified meet must submit to the Extra Events Committee an audited or notarized financial report of the immediate past meet before the ensuing meet may be certified; further, if a meet is certified but is not

held that season, the certification shall lapse. The Extra Events Committee shall have authority to waive one or all of the foregoing provisions for purposes of official Pan American or Olympic competition or final tryouts therefor, or for non-income meets as defined by the Extra Events Committee."

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the Extra Events Committee to accept notarized financial reports for certified track and field meets.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 40. Bylaws: Amend Article 7C, Section 2, page 47, as follows:

"The Extra Events Committee established under Bylaw 7A-2 shall be responsible for certifying that any given meet satisfies these qualifications and other applicable regulations and policies of the Association as determined by the annual Convention or the NCAA Council. The management of a certified meet must submit to the Extra Events Committee an audited **or notarized** financial report of the immediate past meet before the ensuing meet may be certified; further, if a meet is certified but is not held that season, the certification shall lapse. The Extra Events Committee shall have authority to waive one or all of the foregoing provisions for purposes of official Pan American or Olympic competition or final tryouts therefor, or for non-income meets as defined by the Extra Events Committee."

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the Extra Events Committee to accept notarized financial reports for certified gymnastics meets.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

No. 41. Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 1-(a), third paragraph, page 48, as follows:

"The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of **ten eleven** contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season (exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee).

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference, Pacific-8 Conference and Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To allow institutions to schedule one additional football game per year.

Action: Approved by vote of 162-98, effective August 1, 1970.

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

[NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, the following interpretations were approved by the NCAA Council during 1969. Letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1969 NCAA Manual.]

INSTITUTIONAL AID

No. 1. Revise O.I. 2, page 15, as follows:

"Financial aid may be awarded to any student-athlete (defined in O.I. 100) for any term or session (including summer session) during which he is in attendance, provided he has been admitted to the institution as a regular student. **The renewal of a scholarship or grant-in-aid award shall be made on or before July 1 prior to the academic year it is to be effective.** Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution, that institution's conference (if the institution holds such affiliation) and this Association. In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related supplies and books, and not to exceed \$15 per month for incidental expenses) for the undergraduate period of the recipient, it shall be considered to be 'pay' for participation. In addition, the following practices are interpreted as constituting 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved, as amended, by vote of 188-54; effective immediately.

E. Amend proposal No. 1 as follows:

"Financial aid may be awarded to any student-athlete (defined in O.I. 100) for any term or session (including summer session) during which he is in attendance, provided he has been admitted to the institution as a regular student. The renewal of a scholarship or grant-in-aid award shall be made on or before July 1 prior to the academic year it is to be effective. **The institution shall promptly notify each student-athlete who received an award the previous academic year and who is eligible to receive an award for the ensuing academic year whether his grant has been renewed or terminated.** Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution, that institution's conference (if the institution holds such affiliation) and this Association. In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related supplies and books, and not to exceed \$15 per month for incidental expenses) for the undergraduate period of the recipient, it shall be considered to be 'pay' for participation. In addition, the following practices are in-

terpreted as constituting 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics:"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

No. 2. Revise O.I. 2-(e), page 16, as follows:

"(e) Award of excessive complimentary tickets. Complimentary tickets may be awarded to team members in the sport involved and shall not exceed four per student-athlete per contest. **It is not permissible for an institution to repurchase the complimentary tickets awarded to its student-athletes.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by vote of 177-57, effective immediately.

AWARDS

No. 3. Combine O.I. 19 and O.I. 20, page 20, as follows:

"Individual intercollegiate athletic awards and similar mementos to student-athletes shall be limited to those approved **and or** administered by the **member** institution, or **its a member** conference, in keeping with *traditional college the following* requirements: *as to what constitutes an acceptable award. An institution may award a sport blazer (with appropriate insignia or letter) in place of a letter sweater or jacket as an individual intercollegiate athletic award.*

"(a) Institutional awards for recognition of freshman or varsity intercollegiate athletic participation may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sports blazers with appropriate institutional insignia or letter, watches or rings with institutional insignia or comparable identification, scrolls and plaques. In addition, senior awards may be presented in the form of blankets, or awards as listed above, appropriately identified by institutional insignia or letter.

"(b) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition, may include medals, trophies, plaques, scrolls, watches, rings and jewelry of a similar nature. In addition, awards identified by geographical region may be provided if such awards are approved by the Council.

"(c) Awards by a member institution or a member conference (or an organization approved by either) in recognition of conference or national championships, a special attainment or contribution to the institution's team or competitive season (e.g., scholar-athlete awards, most improved player, most minutes played) shall conform to paragraph (b).

"(d) Most valuable player awards presented in established meets, tournaments and postseason football contests may be permitted if the selection of the recipient is by a recognized organization approved by a member institution or conference and the award conforms to paragraph (b).

"In each of the above categories, the awarding institution, conference, or other organization may not provide more than one

award in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment except for the senior award described in paragraph (a) which may constitute a second award. The cost of any single award described in the above paragraphs may not exceed \$75.

"It is not permissible to provide awards or prizes of a tangible nature to student-athletes. Neither paragraph (b) nor (c) permits individual awards in recognition of their specialized outstanding performances in particular contests or events.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote; effective immediately.

F. Amend proposal No. 3 as follows:

"Individual intercollegiate athletic awards and similar mementos to student-athletes shall be limited to those approved or administered by the member institution, or a member conference, in keeping with the following requirements:

"(a) Institutional awards for recognition of freshman or varsity intercollegiate athletic participation may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sports blazers and blankets with appropriate institutional insignia or letter, watches or rings with institutional insignia or comparable identification, scrolls and plaques. In addition, senior awards as listed above may be presented. *in the form of blankets, or awards as listed above, appropriately identified by institutional insignia or letter.*

"(b) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition, may include medals, trophies, luggage, plaques, scrolls, watches, rings and jewelry of a similar nature. In addition, awards identified by geographical region may be provided if such awards are approved by the Council.

"(c) Awards by a member institution or and a member conference (or an organization approved by either) in recognition of conference or national championships. *a special attainment or contribution to the institution's team or competitive season (e.g., scholar-athlete awards, most improved player, most minutes played) shall conform to paragraph (b).*

"In each of the above categories, the awarding institution, conference, or other organization may not provide more than one award in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment except for the senior award described in paragraph (a) which may constitute a second award. The cost of any single award described in the above paragraphs may not exceed \$75.

"Neither paragraph (b) nor (c) permits individual awards in recognition of specialized performances in particular contests or events. **It is permissible, however, for members to provide awards in recognition of special attainments or contributions to a team's competitive season (e.g., scholar-athlete, most improved player, most minutes played); such**

awards must conform in form and value to the preceding limitations."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA EVENTS

No. 4. Revise O.I. 112, page 52, as follows:

"If a student who has attended at least one full academic year (two full semesters or three full quarters) at a collegiate institution transfers to an NCAA member institution, the second institution in determining his eligibility under this legislation shall count all academic courses and only academic courses taken at the previous institution, except that if a student who did not predict 1.600 or better upon graduation from high school transfers from a junior college, he must be graduated from the junior college or present a minimum of *twenty-four (24) forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six (36) seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 2.500 accumulative grade point average and must have spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)*, in order to be eligible under this legislation. The definition of academic courses is left to each institution."

Source: Special NCAA Committee on Junior College Relations, NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 5. Revise O.I. 115, page 52, as follows:

"A student who has established a prediction may not achieve eligibility by means of a subsequent test after enrollment or reporting for uniformed squad practice, whichever is earlier. (NOTE: See O.I. 101 for definition of 'enrolled.')"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

No. 6. Revise O.I. 117, page 53, as follows:

"The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American College Test (ACT) are the only tests which may be used to establish an acceptable table or a prospect's prediction. The qualifying test score submitted by a prospect must represent the total score achieved from a single attempt on any nationally-administered test date, or on a test available to prospective students generally which is administered on a college or university campus under the authority of the SAT or ACT services."

Source: NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements, NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

No. 7. Revise O.I. 118, page 53, as follows:

"The Association's national experience tables shall be reviewed and brought up to date every five years; institutional

and conference tables, every three years. All existing tables shall be reviewed for this purpose by September 1, 1969 during the fall and winter of the 1969-70 academic year. The new tables will apply to those student-athletes entering member institutions after the fall quarter or semester of that year May 1, 1970."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS

No. 8. Revise O.I. 135, page 55, as follows:

"This provision does not apply to developmental clinics or competition involving prospective student-athletes provided such activity is approved by the NCAA Council or a national sports federation of which this Association is a member and provided the activity is conducted by and subject to the control of the host NCAA member institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

RECRUITING—VISITATION

No. 9. Add a new O.I. 153, page 56, renumbering subsequent interpretations, as follows:

"A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at his own expense as often as he wishes. During such visits the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of two complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid visit."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective August 1, 1970.

No. 10. Add a new O.I. 154, page 56, renumbering subsequent interpretations, as follows:

"The total limitations set forth in Bylaw 6-5 apply cumulatively to a prospective student-athlete in high school, as well as any subsequent time he is a student in a college preparatory school or junior college."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote; effective August 1, 1970.

G. Amend proposal No. 10 as follows:

"The total limitations set forth in Bylaw 6-5 apply cumulatively to a prospective student-athlete in high school, as well as any subsequent time 12-month period he is a student in a college preparatory school or junior college."

Source: University of Iowa.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

RECRUITING—ENTERTAINMENT

No. 11. Amend O.I. 154, page 56, as follows:

"There are two general locations in which it is permissible for a member institution or its alumni and other friends to provide reasonable entertainment to a prospective student-athlete, one being the institution's campus, home community and communities contiguous thereto, and the other being the prospect's home community and communities contiguous thereto. Transportation of a prospect to some other site for purposes of entertainment constitutes a violation of Bylaw 6-5-(d). A prospective student-athlete visiting a member institution's campus shall live and take his meals on campus as regular students normally do; his entertainment shall take place on campus with and conducted by regular students. If campus facilities or entertainment are not available, local commercial facilities may be used but at a scale comparable to that of normal student life. The institution (or representatives of its athletic interests) may not provide cash to the prospect for entertainment purposes and may not provide an automobile for his use. A representative of the institution's athletic interests also may provide reasonable entertainment to a prospective student-athlete in the prospect's home community or a community contiguous thereto. Such entertainment counts as a visit under the limitation of Bylaw 6-6-(a). Home visitation, out-of-home entertainment and interview in one continuous action in any 12-hour period shall constitute one permissible visit."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved, as amended, by voice vote; effective immediately.

H. Amend proposal No. 11 as follows:

"There are two general locations in which it is permissible for a member institution to provide reasonable entertainment to a prospective student-athlete, one being the institution's campus and the other being the prospect's home community and communities contiguous thereto. Transportation of a prospect to some other site for purposes of entertainment constitutes a violation of Bylaw 6-5-(d). A prospective student-athlete visiting a member institution's campus shall live and take his meals on campus as regular students normally do; his entertainment shall take place on campus with and conducted by regular students. If campus facilities or entertainment are not available, local commercial facilities may be used, but at a scale comparable to that of normal student life. The institution (or representatives of its athletic interests) may not provide cash to the prospect for entertainment purposes and may not provide an automobile for his use. A representative of the institution's athletic interests also may provide reasonable entertainment to a prospective student-athlete in the prospect's home community or a community contiguous thereto. Such entertainment counts as a visit under the limitation of Bylaw 6-6-(a). Home visitation, out-of-home entertainment and interview in one continuous

action in any 12-hour period shall constitute one permissible visit."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

EXTRA EVENTS

No. 12. Add a new O.I. 171 and renumber present interpretation, page 58, as follows:

"Institutions selected or qualified for a postseason football game shall be required to complete and properly distribute NCAA certification of eligibility forms within one week after receipt of such forms."

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

No. 13. Add a new O.I. 172 and renumber present interpretation, page 58, as follows:

"The term 'hardship' as used in Bylaw 7A-1-(f) is defined as that incapacitating condition resulting from injury (or illness) sustained in the first intercollegiate competitive event of the football season or practice sessions occurring between the first and second such event which causes the loss of the remainder of that season's participation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

LIMITATION ON PLAYING SEASONS

No. 14. Revise O.I. 178, page 58, as follows:

"If one of the first three days of an institution's practice schedule includes a Sunday used for 'non-contact conditioning drills,' that Sunday may not be counted toward fulfillment of the mandatory three-day conditioning practice requirement; further, in determining the number of preseason football 'practice opportunities,' Sunday is explicitly excluded from the counting. This legislation applies to both varsity and freshman teams."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS

No. 15. Add new O.I. 136, page 55, as follows:

"A member institution, through its regular team physician or other designated physician, may conduct a medical examination of a prospective student-athlete at the time of his visit to the campus to determine his medical qualifications to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the examination is conducted without the presence of any athletic department staff member and it does not include any test or procedure designed to measure

the athletic agility or athletic skills of the prospect."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote, effective immediately.

RECRUITING—PRE-COLLEGE EXPENSE

No. 16. Add new O.I. 163, page 57, as follows:

"A member institution, or the representatives of its athletic interests, may provide scholarships, fellowships or other forms of financial aid for postgraduate study reserved exclusively for seniors of that institution who have competed in intercollegiate athletics provided such awards do not exceed more than two per year. Such an award shall be paid to the graduate school at which he matriculates for disbursement to the recipient."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVISIONS OF EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

[The Association's Executive Committee is empowered by the Constitution to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution or Bylaws. Following are revisions in Executive Regulations as adopted by the Executive Committee during 1969. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1969 NCAA Manual.]

INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 1. Revise Executive Regulation 2, Section 3-(c), third paragraph, page 62, as follows:

"Points scored by College Division student-athletes competing in National Collegiate Championship events shall be credited to their respective institutions in team standings."

"The place standings of College Division student-athletes competing in National Collegiate Championship events shall not be considered in compiling team scores."

Action: Approved by vote of 99-96.

ENTRIES

No. 2. Revise Executive Regulation 2, Section 4, page 62, as follows:

"Entries. Member institutions shall be expected to support the meets and tournaments of the Association, unless it is their decision not to engage in any season-end or postseason competition. *Institutions eligible to enter meets and tournaments of the Association shall be limited to active members, paid up and in good standing as of the first of the calendar year, except that institutions eligible to enter the College Division Regional Football, Cross Country and Soccer Championships shall be limited to active members paid up and in good standing for the academic year preceding the event. Institutions which apply for membership prior to September 1 and are admitted thereafter, shall be eligible for fall meets and tournaments, and institutions which apply for membership prior to January 1 and are admitted thereafter, shall be eligible for meets and tournaments of that year following their election to membership. To be eligible to enter teams or individual student-athletes in NCAA meets and tournaments an institution must be an active member, paid up and in good standing and must have certified that it is operating in conformance with Bylaw 4-6-(b) as of September 1 for fall sports, December 1 for winter sports and March 1 for spring sports.*"

Action: Approved by voice vote.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

No. 3. Amend Executive Regulation 2, Section 7-(a), page 64, as follows:

"(a) Gross receipts shall be all revenues derived from the event including sale of tickets (less taxes), programs, radio rights, television rights, movie rights and any other income derived from the operation of the event, except concessions and parking. All tickets shall be accounted for at face value and shall become a part of gross receipts except for such complimentary tickets as are authorized by the governing meet or tournament committee. **Active coaches from NCAA member institutions who are also members in good standing of the affiliated coaches association of the sport involved may be entitled to one complimentary ticket to the meet or tournament.** Any exception to this definition must be approved in advance by the Executive Committee. Gross receipts shall first be used to pay game expenses."

Action: Approved by voice vote.

PROGRAM ADVERTISING

No. 4. Amend Executive Regulation 2, Section 13, page 69, by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"Association policy governing acceptable advertisers and advertising copy for these programs excludes the following: alcoholic beverages, intoxicating malt beverages, political organizations, feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations. Further, advertisements are not acceptable which contain references to or photographs of the games, personnel, broadcasts, telecasts or other activities of professional sports organizations. In addition, drugs and patent medicines are generally excluded, particularly tonics and laxatives; however, analgesics, cold remedies and antacids which are in general use are acceptable. Institutional advertising by pharmaceutical firms also is acceptable."

Action: Amended by vote of 113-65. Motion to reconsider was approved by vote of 108-54. Motion to amend defeated by voice vote. Original proposal approved by voice vote.

I. Amend proposal No. 4 as follows, and delete proposals No. 5 and No. 6:

"Association policy governing acceptable advertisers and advertising copy for these programs excludes the following: alcoholic beverages, intoxicating malt beverages, political organizations, feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations. Further, advertisements are not acceptable which contain references to or photographs of the games, personnel, broadcasts, telecasts or other activities of professional sports organizations. In addition, drugs and patent medicines are generally excluded, particularly tonics and laxatives; however, analgesics, cold remedies and antacids which are in general use are acceptable. Institutional advertising by pharmaceutical firms also is acceptable."

Action: Approved by vote of 113-65. Motion to reconsider was approved by vote of 108-54. Amendment defeated by voice vote.

RADIO

No. 5. Amend Executive Regulation 2, Section 14, second paragraph, pages 69-70, as follows:

"Association policy governing acceptable commercial sponsorship of radio broadcasts of NCAA championship events excludes the following: alcoholic beverages, intoxicating malt beverages, political organizations, and feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations. Further, the advertisements by sponsors not excluded above may not contain references to the games, personnel, broadcasts, telecasts or other activities of professional sports organizations. In addition, drugs and patent medicines are generally excluded, particularly tonics and laxatives; however, analgesics, cold remedies and antacids which are in general use, are acceptable. Institutional advertising by pharmaceutical firms also is acceptable."

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TELEVISION

No. 6. Amend Executive Regulation 2, Section 15, third paragraph, page 70, as follows:

"Association policy governing acceptable commercial sponsorship of television broadcasts of NCAA championship events excludes the following: alcoholic beverages, intoxicating malt beverages, political organizations, and feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations. Further, the advertisements by sponsors not excluded above may not contain references to the games, personnel, broadcasts, telecasts or other activities of professional sports organizations. In addition, drugs and patent medicines are generally excluded, particularly tonics and laxatives; however, analgesics, cold remedies and antacids which are in general use, are acceptable. Institutional advertising by pharmaceutical firms also is acceptable."

Action: Approved by voice vote.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

No. 7. Revise Executive Regulation 3, Section 2-(e), page 71, as follows:

"(e) Expense allowance shall not be granted for any committee meeting held in connection with an annual Convention of the Association except that standing committees which require a minimum of a full day's meeting before or after the Association's annual Convention shall be entitled to a per diem allowance for the number of days involved in the meeting."

Action: Approved by voice vote.

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVISION OF

RECOMMENDED POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

[NOTE: The following revision was approved by the Council during 1969. Letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. Page number listed refers to corresponding page in the 1969 NCAA Manual.]

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS USE OF FACILITIES

No. 1. Revise Policy 5, page 74, by designating the present paragraph Section 1 and adding Section 2, as follows:

"Section 2. Member institutions should not permit the use of their facilities for the conduct of or practice sessions related to any all-star football or basketball contest involving college student-athletes which is not certified by the Association's Extra Events Committee."

Source: NCAA Extra Events Committee, NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVISION OF ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE

[The following revision was approved by the Council during 1969. Letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. Page number refers to corresponding page in the 1969 NCAA Manual.]

No. 1. Amend Section 5-(a), first paragraph, page 77, as follows:

"(a) The Constitution of the Association provides that disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination or suspension of membership may be effected during the period between annual Conventions by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Council present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof, provided the call of such meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the disciplinary problem. As a guiding principle, the NCAA penalty should be broad if the violation or violations reflect a general disregard for the governing rules; in those instances in which the violation or violations are isolated and of relative insignificance, then the NCAA penalty shall be specific and limited. **Previous violations of NCAA legislation shall be a contributing factor in determining the degree of penalty.**"

Source: NCAA Committee on Infractions, NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by vote of 143-34.

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION

[NOTE: The Council, at its meeting of October 20-22, 1969, voted to present the following resolution to the 64th annual Convention for its approval.]

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS

"Be it resolved, that in accordance with Article 6, Section 3, of the NCAA Constitution, the Council of this Association, by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, shall be empowered to adopt in behalf of the membership during 1970, a recodified, reorganized and revised Constitution and Bylaws provided that the document thus adopted shall not become effective until August 1, 1971, and provided further that the document shall be circularized to all members not later than September 15, 1970, and shall be subject to amendment by the 1971 Convention of the Association."

Action: Approved by voice vote.

Appendix B

64th ANNUAL CONVENTION

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

Nominating Committee

Chairman—J. William Davis

- District 1—Seaver Peters, Dartmouth College
- District 2—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University
- District 3—Herbert B. Thompson, Fisk University
- District 4—James R. McCoy, Ohio State University
- District 5—William H. Baughn, University of Colorado
- District 6—J. William Davis, Texas Tech University
- District 7—James R. Jack, University of Utah
- District 8—Raymond T. Ellickson, University of Oregon
- At-Large—James C. Loveless, DePauw University
- At-Large—Jack Sawyer, Wake Forest University
- At-Large—James H. Witham, University of Northern Iowa

Committee on Committees

Chairman—J. Neils Thompson

- District 1—Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
- District 2—Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College
- District 3—Lloyd P. Jordan, Southern Conference
- District 4—Robert C. James, Mid-American Conference
- District 5—G. Clayton Stapleton, Iowa State University
- District 6—Clifford B. Speegle, Southwest Conference
- District 7—Pete McDavid, University of New Mexico
- District 8—James G. Barratt, Oregon State University
- At-Large—Charles D. Henry Grambling College
- At-Large—J. Neil Stahley, Portland State College
- At-Large—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin

Committee on Voting

Chairman—Rix N. Yard

- District 1—Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- District 2—Albert W. Twitchell, Rutgers University
- District 3—Frank L. Forbes, Morehouse College
- District 4—Richard G. Shrider, Miami (Ohio) University
- District 5—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
- District 6—James B. Higgins, Lamar State College of Technology
- District 7—Milton F. Hartvigsen, Brigham Young University
- District 8—William B. Arce, Claremont-Harvey Mudd Colleges
- At-Large—Rix N. Yard, Tulane University

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—John E. Faber

William Exum, Kentucky State College
John E. Faber, University of Maryland
Rev. John J. Horgan, Seton Hall University

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—Robert T. Bronzan

Carl Abner, University of Louisville
Robert T. Bronzan, San Jose State College
Robert R. Ritchie, Clemson University

Parliamentarian

Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan

Appendix C

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Phillip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970	William J. Flynn, Boston College

*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

Appendix D

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1970

(Hotels in parentheses.)

*38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)

*NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943 and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January.

1971 Convention Site

Astroworld Complex, Houston, Texas

January 11-13